43495

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Division
Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

Louise Marie Marose

Date of Birth — Date de naissance	Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance
Aug 15, 1948	Canada

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

20 Mission Street
Sherwood Park, Alberta

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

Public Opinion Concerning Correctional and Penal Reform.

University — Université

University of Alberta, Edmonton

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

Masters of Arts

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade	Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse
1979	Dr. R.A. Silverman

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date	Signature
Oct 15/79	Marose

NL-91 (4/77)

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PUBLIC OPINION CONCERNING CORRECTIONAL AND PENAL REFORM

BY

(C) LOUISE MARIE MOROSE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF

GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1979

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled PUBLIC OPINION CONCERNING CORRECTIONAL AND PENAL REFORM submitted by Louise Marie Morose in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

.....

Supervisor

.....

Bruce P. Elman

Date July 26, 1979

ABSTRACT

There is evidence to suggest that contemporary correctional philosophy is moving away from the policy of sequestering offenders toward strategies and programmes which stress the reintegration of the offender into the community environment. Programmes are being advocated which rely upon community endorsement and participation, yet there is a paucity of evidence to aid policy-makers in determining public opinion toward correctional issues.

The present survey research attempts to investigate public attitudes toward penal and correctional reform, and examines selected social correlates which may influence public attitudes toward correctional philosophy.

The data examined in the present study were based upon a systematic random sample of households in Edmonton, Canada (N=303). In addition, two subsamples were drawn in order to enable a comparison to be made with the major sample. The study carried out by Vicki McNickle Rose (1976) provided the major impetus for the present research.

To summarize the findings of the Edmonton public sample, "receptivity to correctional reform", the dependent variable was found to be inversely

related to age, but positively related to the tendency to attribute the responsibility of crime to societal factors, the tendency not to view crime as a serious problem, educational attainment and occupational prestige. No relationship was found between receptivity to correctional reform and income or experience with victimization. A statistically significant relationship was found between first-hand knowledge and correctional reform however, the relationship was opposite the direction predicted. When the findings of the present research are compared with those of Rose (1976), results reveal a similarity between the two samples.

The final chapter is devoted to a discussion of the findings and an interpretation of the results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is extended to my advisor, Robert Silverman, who provided invaluable advice and insightful comments throughout the entire project and to Jim Creechan and Bruce Elman who provided both guidance and constructive criticism. Appreciation is extended to James Hackler for his assistance during the preliminary stages of the study.

I would like to thank Vicki Rose for permission to replicate her Ph.D. dissertation which made possible my own research in the area of public opinion concerning correctional reform.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my fellow graduate students for their contribution and support, and to my family for their patience and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Significance of the Research	2
Overview of the Problem	4
The Rose Study	8
The Canadian Situation	9
Research Procedures	10
Plan of the Thesis	11
II A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Perception of Crime as a Serious Problem	14
Fear of Victimization	15
The Effect of Knowledge	16
Societal vs. Individual Responsibilities for Crime	20
Demographic Variables	22
The Rose Study	24
The Edmonton Study	27
Formulation of Hypotheses	28
III METHODOLOGY	36
Dependent Variable	38

PAGE

IV ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 42

Statistics 42
Dependent Variable 43
Background Characteristics of the Samples 45
The Washington State Sample . 45
The Edmonton Sample 45
Perception of Crime as a Serious Problem 47
Experience with Victimization . . . 48
The Effect of Knowledge 51
Societal vs. Individual Responsibility for Crime 51
Demographic Variables 53
Factorially Derived Scales 59
Perception of the Seriousness of Crime 64
The Experience of Victimization . . 67
The Effect of Knowledge 67
Individual vs. Societal Responsibility for Crime 69
Demographic Variables. 70

V ANALYSIS OF THE DATA:

THE SUBSAMPLES 78

Demographic Variables 78
Perception of the Seriousness of Crime 80
The Effect of Knowledge 81
Individual vs. Societal Responsibility for Crime 85
Demographic Variables 85
Selected Issues. 89

VI INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS 98

Discussion and Conclusion 112

BIBLIOGRAPHY 118

APPENDIX 123

A. Correspondence 123
B. Questionnaire 130

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
4.1	Hypotheses and Corresponding Indicators from Questionnaire	46
4.2	Correlation Coefficients Indicating Relationships Between Independent Variables and Receptivity to Correctional Reform	49
4.3	Mean Response on Dependent Variable and T-Tests for Sex, Victimization and Knowledge	50
4.4	Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis Between Independent Variables and Receptivity to Correctional Reform	57
4.5	Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis Between Independent Variables and Receptivity to Correctional Reform	58
4.6	Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix - Factor 1 - Prison	60
4.7	Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix - Factor 2 - Rehabilitation	61
4.8	Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix - Factor 3 - Prisoner Rights	62
4.9	Correlation Coefficients Indicating Relationships Between Independent Variables and Dependent Variables	65
4.10	Mean Response on Dependent Variable and T-Test for Sex, Knowledge and Victimization	68
4.11	Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis - Subscale Prison	73
4.12	Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis - Subscale Rehabilitation	74
4.13	Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis - Subscale Prisoner Rights	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
5.1	Correlation Coefficients Indicating Relationships Between Independent Variables and Receptivity to Correctional Reform	82
5.2	Mean Response on Dependent Variable and T-Tests for Sex and Knowledge	84
5.3	Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis Between Independent Variables and Receptivity to Correctional Reform - John Howard Society Subsample	87
5.4	Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis Between Independent Variables and Receptivity to Correctional Reform - Union Members Subsample	88
5.5	Selected Issues and Severity of Sanctions - Edmonton Public Sample (N=303)	91
5.6	Selected Issues and Severity of Sanctions - John Howard Society	93
5.7	Selected Issues and Severity of Sanctions - Union Sample (N=61)	95

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Korn (1971) once expressed regret that the public is a "sacred cow often deferred to but never consulted."

This thesis seeks to examine how the public feels toward selected issues in the area of corrections. Although there is scant information on public attitudes toward penal and correctional policies, there are very definite theoretical assumptions and practical suggestions being put forth by policy-makers, correctional personnel and academics alike. To assess the mood of the public as either positive or negative in terms of proposed or effective changes in correctional philosophy is fallacious in light of the paucity of evidence from which to generalize. The present research is exploratory in nature, and is not subsumed under a rigorous theoretical framework. Rather, the research proposes to redirect the focus and proceed from the "grass roots" to examine how the public feels toward correctional theory. The impetus for the present research comes from the survey research conducted by Vicki McNickle Rose (1976)

in the State of Washington in which she conducted a survey to ascertain how residents of the state felt toward contemporary issues in the area of corrections.

Significance of the Research

There exists currently a resurgence of interest in the area of penal and correctional reform. In addition to the introduction of modifications at the institutional level, we are witnessing a renewed emphasis upon the reintegration of the offender into the community environment. Assumptions are being made regarding public attitudes, and programmes are being advocated which rely to some extent upon the support of the community, yet public receptivity toward correctional philosophy has remained an area virtually unexamined. The public has alternately been viewed as apathetic toward penal policy (Harris, 1968; Johnson, 1974); ignorant of matters of correction (Henshel and Silverman, 1975); ambivalent (Doleschal, 1970); and punitive in attitude (Taves and Mauss, 1975).

How the public actually feels toward corrections is not merely of interest as a solitary phenomenon. Some believe that public opinion has a significant impact on policy decisions. It has been stated: "Any strategy that totally ignores community

opinion is likely to fail" (Duffee and Ritti, 1977: 455). The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967), Chamber of Commerce of the United States (1972), Margolin (1967) and Weeks (1974) are among those who view the participation of community members as an indispensible element of correctional reform. The opinion has been expressed (Hindelang, 1974; Carter, 1972), that the public is anxious to become involved in governmental affairs and in all issues which affect their community — they are desirous of a change in role from passive spectators to active participants in the affairs which affect their lives. Duffee and Ritti (1977) optimistically state that the irradication of the ignorance of public attitudes toward the criminal justice system "is likely to redefine some other major correctional problems or to rearrange completely our strategies for their solution" (Duffee and Ritti, 1977:457). Knowledge of public attitudes toward the criminal justice system has important implications not only for practitioners in the field, but for academics as well.

> Sociologists (and others) often assume that certain perceptions are held, offer no research to validate such assumptions, and state little about who holds them, how many people in what categories and how strongly the beliefs are adhered to (Sagarin, 1975:xii).

Obviously, a systematic analysis of public opinion toward correctional policies is required. The present study of attitudes toward certain issues in penal and correctional policy will hopefully aid in filling the existing void.

The following section briefly reviews the contemporary state of our knowledge of public opinion toward penal and correctional issues.

Overview of the Problem

Some (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1968; Carter, 1972; Reasons, 1974) view the public as becoming increasingly sympathetic toward rehabilitative[1] goals within the criminal justice system. This move toward greater leniency is seen as being predicated upon the recognition by the public that crime and criminal behavior is not due to inherent qualities of the offender, but rather due to the failure of the social system (Reasons, 1974; Skoler, 1975). Research by Smith and Lipsey (1976) revealed that the public was generally supportive of innovative tactics (i.e., conjugal visits) within the penal system. Whereas elite respondents in the Berk and Rossi (1977) study reported that they regarded the public as unreceptive toward more lenient correctional

policies, Rose's (1976) respondents were generally positive in reaction and not as punitively oriented as perceived by the Berk and Rossi (1977) sample.[2]

Other evidence would seem to indicate that the public is indeed punitive and that they would advocate harsh, repressive measures to irradicate the "crime problem".[3] A nation-wide survey conducted in the U.S. by the American Institute for Public Opinion (A.I.P.O.) reported that 79% of the respondents indicated they would support candidates who would invoke harsher sentences for offenders.

Attitudes toward the death penalty are often employed as a guage or indicator of more general repressive measures. Public sentiment toward the issue of capital punishment has become progressively more retentionist in nature. In a Harris poll carried out in 1973, 59% of the respondents favored the death penalty. Chandler (1976) notes that since 1971, polls indicate Canadians are increasingly supportive of the death penalty.

If the available evidence surrounding public opinion in the areas of corrections is both ambiguous and incongruous, no less so are the reactions of the policy-makers. On the one hand, lack of information about public opinion is cited as a rationale for non-action.

> In the area of criminal justice there is a strong tendency to make assumptions about the nature of "public opinion" on various issues. Cautious legislatures often assert that "the public would never countenance innovative and experimental policies (Schur, 1973:10).

Numerous Commissions and organizations repeatedly claim that though they would be supportive of more lenient correctional policies, consideration of public reaction serves as an impediment to the implementation of such strategies (Doleschal, 1970; Chamber of Commerce of the United States; 1972; Berk and Rossi, 1977).

On the other hand, steps <u>are</u> being taken, and programmes <u>are</u> being implemented. Contemporary corrections is witnessing such strategies as diversion programmes, the de-criminalization of offenses, and the introduction of community-based corrections such as half-way houses. Correctional philosophy maintains that increased community treatment will become the ideal of the system.

> Only the community in the end can really solve the crisis. The roots of crime can be destroyed through a strong public resolve — more than lip service, more than pious claims and pious hopes — to attack the underlying causes of crime: poverty, discrimination, broken homes and mental illness (Harris, 1968:10).

The employment of fines options programmes is becoming one of the most popular sentencing

options in Canada (Hogarth, 1971). As Skoler (1975) states community treatment is the "in-thing".

> ...it is only in the community that rehabilitation of the offender can ultimately take place. Here is where he must live, if he is to take his place in harmony with the rest of society, and here is where he must be adjusted to the habits and styles of life which will enable him to do so (Skoler, 1975:4).

The foregoing lofty resolve is muted somewhat by the other view, represented by a single interview for illustrative purposes:

> ...looking at our own city where its getting into such a state that it's not safe for a sane person to be on the streets. By punishing these criminals with punishment doesn't mean a thing to them, such as a few years off the street eating good meals that we taxpayers pay for. I can't see why we taxpayers are paying to see these nuts walking around. They are of no use to society and should be dealt with (Interview with an Edmonton citizen, Edmonton Sun, September, 1978).

The introduction of reintegrative correctional programmes based upon some vague notions of public opinion is of dubious merit. Programmes such as community-based corrections, depend at least to some extent upon the endorsement of the public.

> Members of the public supply the tax money[4] that supports the correctional services; their direct participation is necessary to a successful correctional program; they are the ones who suffer if efforts to curb the incidence of crime fail, and in the final analysis correctional advances are dependent on public attitudes

(Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections, 1969:31).

Rose (1976) addresses some of the above concerns in her study and much of this thesis involves a partial replication of the Rose (1976) research.

The Rose Study

The purpose of this research carried out in the State of Washington was "to assess the nature of public opinion and to compare those perceptions with those of policy and decision-makers" (Rose, 1976:2).

A self-administered questionnaire[5] was mailed to a random sample of residents of the State of Washington in 1975.

In this study, the dependent variable, "receptivity toward correctional reform" was operationalized by summing the scores of eighteen Likert-type questionnaire items. The dependent variable was found to be negatively related to age, but positively related to educational attainment, occupational prestige, political liberalism, political efficacy, a tendency not to view crime as a serious problem, and the view that the responsibility for crime rested with society.

The Rose (1976) study which provided the background for the present research will be reviewed in greater detail in the following chapter.

Although there is a tendency to subsume the policies of Canada and the United States as "American", there are some indications that the two are not entirely similar. The following section looks at some differences which may exist.

The Canadian Situation

There is some evidence to suggest that results from the Edmonton study would differ from the Rose (1976) findings. This is consistent with Quinney's (1970) suggestion that community members develop distinct patterns of reaction to crime. The construction and diffusion of criminal conceptions is likely to be peculiar to certain areas. In addition, Tepperman (1977) suggests that Canadians are more conservative in outlook than are Americans. He suggests that Americans have consistently expressed stronger support over the years surveyed for the abolition of the death penalty. Chandler (1976) supports the contention that the Canadian public is more inclined toward the use of the death penalty than is the American public. The Law Reform Commission notes: "Canada...is one of the harshest Western countries when it comes to the use of prison sentences. Many of the terms imposed are far too long, one half the people in prison should never be there,

and so many are in jail that those few needing help cannot get it" (Tempperman, 1977:2).

The foregoing evidence would suggest that our Canadian respondents might be more conservative in outlook than their American counterparts.

The objective of the present survey research is to examine public attitudes toward penal and correctional policies and proposed changes in the Canadian Justice System, and to isolate those variables which may influence public opinion toward selected issues in contemporary corrections.

The methodological approach employed in this research is briefly discussed in the following section.

Research Procedures

A systematic random sample of five hundred Edmonton residences was drawn and a self-administered questionnaire was mailed to the sample of households in mid-July of 1978. Two follow-up procedures were carried out. The respondents were sent two letters of appeal emphasising the importance of their participation in the study. The first letter of appeal was accompanied by a replacement copy of the questionnaire in the event the original copy had been misplaced.

Subsamples were drawn which would enable a comparison to be made with the "public" sample: members of the John Howard Society, and members of

a local union.

Plan of the Thesis

Chapter II of this thesis is devoted to a review of the relevant literature. The methodology employed in the present research will be discussed in Chapter III. Chapters IV and V are devoted to a discussion of the analysis of the data and findings of the research. The final chapter will discuss the interpretation of the analysis and will provide recommendations derived from the data.

FOOTNOTES

[1]All measures subsumed under the term "rehabilitative" are not necessarily less severe, and may in fact be extremely punitive and dehabilitating. In this paper, however, the terms "rehabilitation" and "reform" should be taken in the context of those measures and strategies which are less severe and which stress reintengration of offenders. The term "reform" requires further qualification. "Reform" refers to the deviation from anything that is. In the context of this research however the term is employed to refer to those policies considered more lenient from those presently in practice.

[2]The findings of the Berk et al. study examined by Rose (1976) were available in unpublished form in 1973. Subsequent to the Rose (1976) survey, the Berk and Rossi study was published in 1977, thereby accounting for the seeming disparity between the one year lapse between the Rose (1976) study and the Berk and Rossi (1977) research.

[3]It is interesting to note that many criminologists seem to be becoming more punitive in light of recent research. (See for example Martinson, 1974).

[4]All too frequently, the rationale cited for the examination of public opinion refers to the notion that citizens are taxpayers and that somehow makes them deserving of consultation. This is somewhat simplistic. Community members are not as insulated from the criminal justice process as some seem to assume. These are the victims of crime, the initiators of the criminal process, and at times, through the intensity of their reaction to certain crimes the "judges" who impose their influence on the sentencing process. In addition, those persons making policy-decisions are acting in the capacity of representatives of the public.

[5]The questionnaire items in the Rose (1976) study were a modified version of those employed in the Berk and Rossi (1977) study. The original items were developed from The National Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The present chapter is devoted to a review of the contributions of selected researchers as they relate to the manner in which the public reacts to issues of correctional reform. Unfortunately, not only is there a scarcity of empirical data in the area, but in many cases previous studies are overly descriptive (Gibbons, et al., 1972) or concentrate solely on such singular issues as attitudes toward the death penalty (see for example, Vidmar and Ellsworth, 1974). Following a review of the relevant literature, we present a more complete examination of the Rose (1976) survey. The decision to use the Rose (1976) study as a foundation for the present research was based on the fact that her study represents one of the rare attempts at a sophisticated and systematic effort to provide a more thorough analysis of the various correlates of public opinion toward crime and crime control. The final section of this chapter incorporates the findings of the Rose (1976) study with other contributions on the subject in order to present the hypotheses which guide the present research.

Perception of Crime as a Serious Problem

During the 1960's crime and public concern regarding crime became major social issues. The President's Crime Commission was established, in part, to examine anxiety about crime.

> A chief reason that this Commission was organized was that there is widespread public anxiety about crime. In one sense, this entire report is an effort to focus that anxiety on the central problems of crime and criminal justice. The necessary part of that effort has been to study as carefully as possible the anxiety itself (President's Crime Commission, 1967:49).

Jennie McIntyre (1967) reviews several public opinion polls and surveys which attest to the salience of public anxiety with crime. A 1963 Gallup poll presented an adult sample with a list of 39 problems potentially facing their community. It was found that juvenile delinquency was isolated most frequently as the major problem. Harris surveys report that each year respondents progressively express a rise in concern for their personal safety. In addition, when the National Opinion Research Centre asked a nation-wide sample to choose the major domestic problem to which they had most recently been attentive, Americans stated they regarded crime as the major social problem, second only to race relations. This lends further support to the results of polls conducted by Harris and Gallup which reflect citizen opinion that

crime is on the increase.

As McIntyre (1967) points out, both the study carried out by the Bureau of Social Science, and the NORC survey, revealed that the fear of crime permeates the lives of many Americans.

In summary, research indicates a widespread concern about crime as a national and personal problem. Furthermore, the popular view is that crime is on the increase. As will be discussed later in this section, public fear and concern toward crime may emerge as an important variable in attitudes toward the control of crime.

Fear of Victimization

Although Harris surveys consistently find that over the recent years fear of victimization is increasing, McIntyre (1967) points out that Ennis (1967) reported no significant relationship between victimization and the concern expressed for crime. Victims did however, reveal some apprehension about the possibility of burglary and robbery, slightly more frequently than non-victims.

The BSSR study found that the experience of victimization was not a major controlling factor in a person's life, as evidenced by the fact that few of those interviewed remembered the occurrences. As McIntyre notes, "experience with victimization

does not determine attitudes toward crime" (McIntyre, 1967:189).

The foregoing discussion suggests that experience of victimization may not significantly affect one's attitudes toward crime control.

The Effect of Knowledge

This portion of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the extent of individual knowledge about crime and corrections, and the infleunce one's perceptions may have toward the issue of crime and crime control. When one has limited contact or interaction with others, the tendency to stereotype is a prevalent reaction. The effect of first-hand knowledge is not restricted to attitudes toward inmates or criminal offenders, but permeates all facets of life in a more general sense. As Smith and Lipsey point out, "Sociologists have long assumed that social contact or interaction influence perception and opinions" (Smith and Lipsey, 1976:121).

Smith and Lipsey (1976) carried out a study to examine public attitudes toward the issues of conjugal visitation, work release and weekend leaves for inmates. Two separate samples in Tennessee and Georgia were interviewed by telephone. Sample A (N=64) was asked whether they were personally acquainted with anyone in prison, and were asked,

"Are you in favor of overnight visits for prisoners by their spouses?". Sample B (N=104) was asked as well whether they were acquainted with an inmate, but the question posed regarding conjugal visitation was phrased in a more specific manner, i.e. "I am in favor of overnight visits for prisoners by their spouses which would include sexual relations." In addition, Sample B was asked their opinion toward the policies of work release and weekend leaves for inmates. The authors report that almost 30% of both samples were acquainted with an inmate, and over 50% of the respondents in both samples endorsed conjugal visitation. In addition, it was found that there was strong support for work release and weekend leaves. The study suggests that the public may not be as punitively oriented as some would expect, but the major issue which emerges is the interaction between personal acquaintance with an inmate and the supportive stance expressed toward more lenient policies for offenders.

In a survey carried out in San Francisco and Portland (Gibbons, et al., 1972), respondents were asked their opinions on half-way houses, their opinions on release on one's own recognizance, and whether they knew of anyone who had been arrested for a major crime. It was found that approximately two thirds of the respondents endorsed both the

notion of half-way houses, and the policy of release on one's own recognizance. In the San Fransisco sample, 42.9% reported knowing someone who had been arrested for a major crime. In the Portland sample, 35.7% reported knowledge of someone who had been arrested for a major crime. Although a higher percentage of the sample stated they were not acquainted with anyone who had been arrested, one cannot assume a lack of relationship between "knowledge" and support for more lenient correctional policy. The wording of the question to include the term "major" may have seriously biased the results, as some respondents may have been acquainted with someone who had been arrested for a minor offence which would constitute a form of knowledge as well. In addition, whether a crime is considered "major" is open to personal interpretation, as the term "major" may conjure up various images for the various respondents.

Doleschal (1970) reviews a research experiment carried out in California which examined the influence of knowledge of an offender's past on the severity of punishment endorsed by the respondents. A control group and an experimental group were given information on ten crimes and were asked to indicate the type of penalty they would recommend. The experimental group however, was given detailed knowledge of the life history of the offender. The experimental

group's recommendation for punishment was less severe than that of the control group on seven of the ten crimes presented. It was concluded that familiarity with an offender's past affects and modifies the attitudes of others.

As previously noted, lack of knowledge of, or limited interaction with others encourages stereotyping. Doleschal (1970) reported the findings that many of his respondents viewed the delinquent as "ill". The diffusion of the concept "deviant" and the lack of distinction between the criminal and the mentally ill was substantiated by Galliher's (1970) study in Missouri. When respondents were asked: "How close to your home would you say is the nearest thing to a prison, a reformatory or a state training school?", a sizeable minority did not distinquish between these facilities and mental institutions. Carter notes:

> Although many laud the goals of community-based corrections, when it gets down to where in the community they should be, traditional fears and stereotypes (my emphasis) are involved (Carter, 1972:362).

The assumption of the existence of, or knowledge of "criminal types" based upon lack of acquaintance with offenders may seriously impede the development or expansion of community based corrections. The effects of stereotyping could have deleterious effects upon the reintegration of the offender into the general society. As Harris notes:

> People are petrified literally of the negative influence of the ex-offender in the community. And they are not really aware of the positive potential impact that is in the ex-offender and his returning to good citizenship in the community (Harris, 1968: 12).

First-hand knowledge, which is cognitive in nature may serve to negate or to modify the affective component of fear. Galliher makes the following suggestion:

> Encouraging tours of institutions seems to make good public relations sense because this firsthand experience gives the public some other source of information about prisons besides movies and television. These tours can provide a more positive and controlled picture of corrections and therefore make for more favourable attitudes toward corrections (Galliher, 1970:249).

It would appear then, that knowledge may be a major factor in one's acceptance of more lenient correction policies.

Societal vs. Individual Responsibility for Crime

Those who posit that the public is receptive to such measures as community-based corrections often suggest that a major factor contributing to the move away from a punitive stance has been influenced by public recognition that criminal behaviour cannot be attributed to the individual qualities of the offender, but rather due to the failure of the social system (Reasons, 1974; Skoler, 1975). According to Johnson (1974) the realization on the part of the public that the cause of crime lies within the social system has

been a major issue lending impetus to the new reform movement in corrections. Conklin (1975) suggests that if one attributes crime to environmental or social conditions, one is more apt to be supportive of social action programmes as a means of erradicating the problem of crime.

Miller (1973) discusses the "right" or "conservative" faction and their ideological positions toward correctional policy. He suggests that the more conservative one is, the more likely one is to view individuals as responsible for their actions as opposed to regarding the social system as a possible variable. Fagan (1978) summarizes Miller's presentation of the individual versus societal issue:

> ...the "right" assume individual responsibility for personal behavior (as opposed to placing the blame on social conditions); proclaims the need for a strong moral order based on familial and religious values (as opposed to seeing the current moral order as poorly adapted to existing social conditions); stresses security of personal property (as opposed to emphasizing the injustices of the distribution of wealth and power in society); asserts the needs for conformity to legitimate authorities (instead of saying that the authorities should be more responsive to the needs of the socially disadvantaged); and emphasizes divisions within society by various social groupings (rather than pointing to the need for a more open society that provides everyone with greater opportunities)(Fagan, 1976: 26).

In view of the foregoing literature, one may expect that viewing the individual as opposed to the environment as a cause of crime would be related to a more punitive stance toward the issue of the control of crime.

Demographic Variables

Previous research also reveals the impact of demographic variables on the stance taken regarding causes of crime and views toward crime control. A survey carried out by the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure (California)(Henshel and Silverman, 1975) posed the question, "What do you think would help most to lessen the current crime rate?" Responses to the questionnaire item revealed the following: increased scientific study of the causes of crime (28%); better opportunities for poor people (24%); stiffer sentences and longer imprisonment (24%); more law enforcement officers (11%); social and psychiatric help for offenders (8%). Of significance here is that the younger, better-educated, employed respondents supported increased scientific study of crime or better opportunities for jobs and education, as opposed to punitive measures.

Gibbons et al. (1972) report that in their study carried out in San Francisco and Portland, almost 2/3 of those sampled endorsed measures such as

better education and employment opportunities, and increased study of crime causation to reduce crime. Of note is that the majority of respondents had some college education or were college graduates.

Hindelang (1974) examines a survey conducted in 1970 which reported that those persons with higher income and higher education levels were more likely to express dissatisfaction with the present correctional system.

Research suggests then, that socio-economic status, commonly considered by the interrelated elements of income, occupation and education may emerge as an important variable in affecting one's attitude toward crime and crime control.

Studies reveal that age is another variable which may influence opinion toward crime and crime control. Richardson et al. (1972) found that respondents under 30 years of age were less likely to evaluate correctional institutions in a positive manner. Another indication that age is of significance comes from the study carried out by Smith and Lipsey (1976) in which they found that older respondents were strongly opposed to the notion of conjugal visitation as an innovative policy.

As previously mentioned, attitudes toward the death penalty are often used to measure wider issues

in the area of punishment. Results from polls by Gallup suggest that women are more opposed to capital punishment than are males. In addition, Smith and Lipsey (1976) reported that in one of their samples, more females than males endorsed conjugal visitation. This lends support for the contention that sex may influence one's position toward the control of crime.

The foregoing discussion has attempted to isolate those relevant variables which are likely to influence how one reacts toward issues of correctional reform. A detailed discussion of the Rose (1976) study is presented below.

The Rose Study

The survey responses in the Rose (1976) study were solicited by self-administered mail questionnaire. Respondents were randomly selected from telephone listings in each of the communities in the State of Washington. A response rate of 81% was achieved (N=1,121).

The questionnaire included Likert-type items with five response alternatives: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree. The dependent variable, "receptivity to correctional reform" was operationalized by employing 18 items to create the scale. These items will be discussed in greater detail

in the forthcoming presentation of the Edmonton study. With the exception of the phrasing of some questions, and with the deletion of two items, the dependent variable was largely duplicated in the present research.

The independent variables examined in the Rose (1976) study included sex, age, ethnic background, educational attainment, occupational prestige, family income, political party affiliation, experience with victimization, political ideology,[1] political efficacy,[2] perception of the seriousness of crime and opinions concerning individual versus societal responsibility for crime. The hypotheses were tested using the correlation coefficient (r), and the t-test to measure the significance of difference between means.

The hypotheses proposed in the State of Washington study and the findings are presented in summary form below.

Hypothesis 1. Women will be significantly more receptive to correctional reform than men. Support was found for this hypothesis; the difference between mean scores on the dependent variable was significant beyond the .005 level.

Hypothesis 2. There will be an inverse relationship between age and receptivity to correctional reform. The correlation between this variable and the dependent variable was significant beyond the .001 level.

Hypothesis 3. Non-whites will be significantly more receptive to correctional reform than whites. No support was found for this hypothesis.[3]

Hypothesis 4. There will be a positive relationship between educational attainment and receptivity to correctional reform. A moderate, but significant correlation was found between variables.

Hypothesis 5. There will be a positive relationship between occupational prestige and receptivity to correctional reform. This hypothesis received significant but weak support.

Hypothesis 6. There will be a positive relationship between income and receptivity to correctional reform. A near zero correlation was found between income and the dependent variable.[4]

Hypothesis 7. There will be a positive relationship between political efficacy and receptivity to correctional reform. A weak but statistically significant correlation was found for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 8. Democrats will be significantly more receptive to correctional reform than Republicans. Support was found for this hypothesis.[5]

Hypothesis 9. Conservatives will be significantly less receptive to correctional reform than liberals. Rose found that "The correlation coefficient of greatest magnitude between any of the independent variables

and receptivity to correctional reform is observed for the relationship between political ideology and the dependent variable."[6]

Hypothesis 10. Those who attribute the responsibility for crime to individuals will be least receptive to correctional reform. This hypothesis met with some support.

Hypothesis 11. Those who perceive crime is a very serious problem will be least receptive to correctional reform. The relationship for this hypothesis was weak but statistically significant.

Hypothesis 12. There will be no relationship between victimization and receptivity to correctional reform. The difference between mean responses on the dependent variable for victims versus non-victims was found not to be significant.

The Edmonton Study

The survey research carried out in Edmonton, Canada partially replicated the foregoing Rose (1976) study. However, in addition to the predictor variables of sex, age, SES, victimization, perception of the seriousness of crime and opinion concerning individual versus societal responsibility for crime as reviewed in the State of Washington, the independent variable "knowledge" is also included. The examination of the

effect of knowledge was tapped by asking respondents whether they were personally acquainted with an inmate, and whether or not they had toured a prison or corrections centre.

Formulation of Hypotheses

The final portion of this chapter is devoted to the formulation of hypotheses. The empirical evidence previously discussed and the consideration of the Rose findings provided the framework for the hypotheses. Empirical evidence which prompted the formulation of the hypotheses will be briefly reviewed.

Researchers (McIntyre, 1967; Ennis, 1967; Biderman et al., 1967) have reported that the public is concerned about crime, and have indicated citizens view crime as on the increase. Rose (1976) cites Conklin (1975): "Insofar as penal institutions isolate potential offenders, they somewhat alleviate the threat of crime, thus reducing public concern." One may expect that changes in the present system which stress greater leniency and de-emphasize the sequestering of offenders would increase the concern of the public for their saftey, and negatively affect their general endorsement of changes or innovative tactics within the justice system. In light of that consideration, the following hypothesis was proposed:

Hypothesis One: Those who perceive crime as a very serious problem will be least receptive to correctional reform.

With regards to victimization, the BSSR study found that the experience of victimization did not become a major controlling factor in a person's life, as evidenced by the fact that few interviewed were able to recall the experience. Conklin (1975) states as well that direct victimization does not make one more fearful. Commenting on surveys of public opinion, Galliher comments:

> Very little statistical correlation was found between the experience of having been victimized and the attitudes toward most aspects of the crime problem. The attitudes of victims and nonvictims were not significantly different in relation to either the individual's concern with the crime problem or his perception of crime (Galliher, 1970: 457).

The contention then, is that victims and nonvictims will not differ in their attitudes toward correctional reform. As such, the following hypothesis is presented:

Hypothesis Two: There will be no relationship between victimization and receptivity toward correctional reform.

Research indicates that persons who either have been acquainted with an offender, or who have visited prisons (Smith and Lipsey, 1976; Galliher, 1970) are more likely to favor lenient programmes. Chandler

(1976) found that those MP's who resided in areas where prisons were located were more likely to vote to abolish capital punishment. Their close proximity to prisons has perhaps created an opportunity for interaction with offenders, as well as increasing their knowledge of the functioning of correctional institutions. Berk and Rossi (1977) found that respondents in their survey who had intimate knowledge of issues of corrections accurately perceived the shortcomings of the system. In light of the foregoing, the following hypothesis is presented:

Hypothesis Three: There will be a positive relationship between first-hand knowledge of prisons and receptivity to correctional reform.

A factor which emerges from the literature suggests that whether or not a punitive stance is taken depends upon whether one attributes crime as a result of the social system or as a result of some inherent qualities of the individual (Reasons, 1974; Skoler, 1975; Johnson, 1974).

Rose cites Conklin (1975) who suggests that attributing crime to individual characteristics provides a justification for imprisonment rather than such measures as social action programmes to deal with the issue. This provides the basis for the next hypothesis:

Hypothesis Four: Those who attribute the responsibility for crime to the individual will be least receptive to correctional reform.

It is generally accepted that persons who occupy various positions within the social strata develop distinctive ways to viewing the world. Socio-economic status, with reference to one's occupation, education and income emerges as an important variable to be examined.

A survey carried out by the Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure (California)(Henshel and Silverman, 1975) found that the better educated respondents supported increased scientific study of crime and endorsed measures such as better opportunities for jobs and education. Gibbons et al. (1972) reported that the higher the level of education, the more likely was one to endorse social measures to alleviate the crime problem.

Hindelang (1974) cites a survey carried out in 1970 which found that respondents with higher income and higher education level were more likely to express doubt over the deterrent influence of the correctional system. Dissatisfaction with the present system would seem likely to indicate that respondents in higher SES brackets would be supportive of changes in the present system. In light of the foregoing, we present the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis Five: There will be a positive relationship between educational attainment and receptivity to correctional reform.

Hypothesis Six: There will be a positive relationship between income level and receptivity to correctional reform.

Hypothesis Seven: There will be a positive relationship between occupational level and receptivity toward correctional reform.

There is evidence to indicate that age is an important variable in determining one's stance on issues in corrections. Polls by Gallup for example, report that younger respondents are more likely to oppose the death penalty. Other researchers (Richardson et al., 1972; Smith and Lipsey, 1976; Rose, 1976) have found support for the contention that younger respondents are generally more supportive of changes in corrections.

Hypothesis Eight: There will be an inverse relationship between age and receptivity toward correctional reform.

The Gallup findings that women are generally less punitive is consistent with Rose's suggestion that women have usually been more sympathetic toward issues of civil liberties and leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis Nine: Women will be significantly more receptive to correctional reform than men.

Tepperman (1977) argues that Canadians are more conservative in outlook than Americans. This position is consistent with that of Chandler (1976) who suggests that the American public has been less likely to endorse the use of the death penalty. In addition, the Law Reform Commission suggests that Canada is one of the most punitive Western countries when it comes to the imposition of harsh prison sentences. On the strength of the foregoing the final hypothesis is presented:

Hypothesis Ten: Edmontonians will be significantly less receptive to correctional reform than citizens of the State of Washington.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Rose (1976) employs the term "political ideology" to refer to the liberalism-conservatism dimension, i.e., the "left" and "right" ideological positions.

[2]The term "political efficacy refers to the notion that one's participation in the political process can influence that process. Campbell et al. defines the term as follows:

> ...the feeling that individual political action does have, or can have, an impact upon the political process, i.e., that it is worth while to perform one's civic duties. It is the feeling that political and social change is possible, and that the individual citizen can play a part in bringing about this change (Campbell, et al., 1954:187).

[3]This hypothesis was deleted from the Edmonton Study because no support was reported by Rose, and in addition the variable of ethnicity could likely be related to socio-economic status.

[4]Earlier on in her research, Rose cites Blalock (1972) as suggesting an r of zero or near zero may not indicate that two variables are unrelated, but in fact may indicate a curvilinear relationship. This is not re-introduced in the discussion when a near zero correlation was found for the variable of income.

[5]This hypothesis was not included in the present study. With regards to American political parties, Rose (1976) cites literature to support the contention that Republicans assume a more conservative stance on social issues than do Democrats. There is no clear documentation to suggest that Canadian political parties are consistently "right" or "left" in their position on social policies.

[6]Even though Rose reports that the Conservative/Liberal hypothesis revealed the correlation of greatest magnitude, it was decided to not examine that hypothesis in this study. The question is merely stated as: "Which of the following best describes your stance on political issues: Conservative, Middle of the Road, Liberal or Radical". It was felt that this question laid the door open for socially desirable responses. In addition, the response to this single item may have been dependent on previous responses given in the questionnaire.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The present chapter presents a discussion of the research design employed in the present study.

In this survey, a systematic random sample of Edmonton households was drawn and a self-administered questionnaire mailed to the respondents in mid-July of 1978. The households involved in the research were randomly selected from the Edmonton Street Address Numerical Directory which covered the period from January to June, 1978. 303 responses were received from the Edmonton sample of those 18 years or older. Of the original 500 residences contacted, 30 respondents were deleted from the sample for reasons of illness, age, etc. The response rate calculated on the N=470 yielded a 64.47% return. In addition, two subsamples were selected for the purpose of comparisons with the "general public". Responses were elicited from members of the John Howard Society, chosen specifically because of their knowledge of the field of corrections. A mailing list of 170 members was provided to the researchers. 107[1] completed the questionnaire,

yielding a response rate of 66%. Union members were the second subsample chosen. Out of 120 questionnaires mailed, 61[2] returned the completed form, bringing the response rate to 50.83%.

The questionnaire,[3] which was four and a half pages in length was accompanied by a covering letter (see Appendix A) which described the nature of the study, and stressed the importance of the views and opinions of the respondents to the research. The covering letter stressed as well, the purely voluntary nature of their participation in the project. Two letters of appeal were sent to the respondents if their completed questionnaire had not been received within a ten-day period. The first letter of appeal was accompanied by a replacement copy of the questionnaire for the convenience of the respondents. Following the suggestions put forth by Dillman et al. (1974), the questionnaire was photo-reduced for reasons of appearance, and all covering letters were personally signed by the researcher in order to make the correspondence more personal. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was included in order to add an incentive to to complete the questionnaire.

The questionnaire items (see Appendix B) included standard demographic items, questions regarding attitudes toward changes in present penal and correctional policies, experience and victimiza-

tion, knowledge of an inmate, questions asking whether the responsibility for crime was societal or individual, and whether the respondents viewed crime as an increasingly serious problem in the city. In addition, five examples of offences ranging in severity were presented, and various sentence alternatives were provided.

As in the Rose study, a Likert-type scale was employed. A difference in the present study, however is that the category "undecided" was eliminated. The rationale was to avoid the possibility of "fence-sitting" and encourage the respondents to reply to the choices presented. The categories of the scale were: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. The dependent variable was constructed by summing the respondents' scores on selected questionnaire items. The scale used by Rose (1976) was retained in the present research as the items demonstrated high internal consistency indicating the presence of a common dimension.

The dependent variable "receptivity to correctional reform"[4] was operationalized by combining the following items.

Dependent Variable

> There would be fewer hardened criminals if we kept offenders in the community and out of prison.

Our corrections system is too lenient with offenders.

We should favor expansion of prisons rather than corrections programmes like half-way houses.

We should grant weekend leaves so that prisoners can visit their families and friends.

We should stress vocational training closely related to outside jobs for prisoners.

We should give prison guards more power to discipline prisoners.

We should bring back the death penalty.

We should allow prison officials to read the prisoners' mail.

Solitary confinement should be used more often.

We should allow visits by prisoners' spouses for sexual purposes.

There should be more opportunity for parole.

Prisoners should be allowed to take part in prison self-government.

There should be more use made of community-based corrections (for example, half-way houses).

Offenders should be required to do voluntary work for the community rather than be sent to prison.

Greater use should be made of physical punishment in prison (for example, whipping).

Community-based programmes which allow offenders to hold jobs in the community and return to jail evenings and weekends are a good idea.

The foregoing items which comprised the dependent variable were summated according to the weights assigned to the items. A score of four was given to the "strongly agree" statements for the positive items, and a score of one was assigned to the items phrased in a negative manner. The respondents were given a total score based upon the summation of total scores received. In the present study then, the possible range was from 16 to 64.

The foregoing section has described the essential elements of the research design of the Edmonton study and has provided a discussion of the methods of data collection. The two following chapters are devoted to the presentation of the statistical analysis of the data gathered from the survey research.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The response rate for members of the John Howard Society was calculated on an N of 162. The membership list had been compiled some years before, and an up-to-date list was unavailable. Because of this many were no longer active members. Had the list been a more recent one, we are confident that the response rate would have been much higher than the one reported here.

[2]As no mailing list was available for the Union members, it was deemed convenient to mail the questionnaires out in bulk for internal distribution. Because no names were available, no follow-up procedures were possible.

[3]The use of a mail questionnaire as opposed to an interview situation was selected in an effort to reduce costs, avoid the possibility of interviewer bias and to reduce the likelihood of socially desirable responses.

[4]Again it must be stressed that references to "reform" strategies are to be understood in terms of those measures and strategies which are less severe and which stress the reintegration of offenders.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In Chapter II the ten hypotheses examined in this research study were presented. In this chapter the results of the statistical analyses carried out in testing those hypotheses are described. The findings derived from the responses of Edmonton householders (N=303) will be itemized and will be compared with those reported by Rose (1976) in her study carried out in the State of Washington (N=1, 121). As mentioned in the previous chapter, two subsamples were selected for purposes of comparison with the larger Edmonton sample namely, local members of the John Howard Society (N=107) and members of a local union (N=61). The following chapter is devoted to the presentation of the findings of the two subsamples.

Statistics

As this study is largely based upon the Rose (1976) research, the procedures of data analysis are similar. The statistical techniques utilized are the t-test, Pearson's correlation coefficient and

stepwise multiple regression. In addition, to ensure that the dependent variable was in fact unidimensional in nature, factor analysis was employed in order to examine the possibility of the existence of separate dimensions in our scale.

Before proceeding, some qualifications are in order regarding differences between the two studies. The present research partially replicated the Rose (1976) study, but consideration of the appropriateness of some of the questionnaire items resulted in slight modification of the items.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable "receptivity to correctional reform" was operationalized by combining sixteen items from the questionnaire (compared to the eighteen used by Rose). Although the meaning of the items was retained, in some instances the wording was changed slightly.[1] Two examples of those modifications are given below. The Rose question regarding censorship of mail in prisons was changed to prison officials reading the prisoners' mail. "Reinstatement of the death penalty" was changed to "We should bring back the death penalty." There was one deletion made in the present questionnaire worthy

of note. When discussing community-based corrections policies Rose employed the term "non-dangerous" to refer to those offenders who would be likely to participate, for example (responses: definitely favor to definitely oppose): "Community-based programs for non-dangerous offenders who would be confined evenings and weekends while holding a job in the community." While one can presume that indeed it would be those offenders who would be selected for such programmes, it was felt that inclusion of the term would bias the results and as such the decision was made to eliminate the reference, i.e. the term "non-dangerous" is subjective and not readily measured.

Reliability is concerned with the consistency of a measure. With regards to the dependent variable, the present study found that the alpha coefficient was .889. Coefficient alpha[2] is analogous to the mean of all the split half reliabilities and presents a measure of internal consistency. Rose (1976) reported in alpha of .894, which indicates that the slight modification of wording and the deletion of the two items did not significantly influence the two studies.

In the Rose (1976) study, tests of hypotheses were carried out by analysing responses to single questionnaire items. In the present study, however, multiple indicators were employed to tap a single dimension in order to increase confidence in our findings (see Table 4.1).

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLES

Before proceeding with the presentation of the findings of the survey an examination of the demographic variables of the samples is in order.

The Washington State Sample (N=1,121)

Respondents in the Washington State sample were comprised of 50 percent males and 50 percent females, with the average age of the respondents reported at 45.46. Rose indicated that the average number of school years completed by the sample was 12.98 years. The average annual family income of the respondents was over $15,568.

The Edmonton Sample (N=303)

The Edmonton sample was comprised of 47% female respondents compared with 53% male respondents, the majority of whom were married (64%). The mean age of the sample, based upon those 18 years

TABLE 4.1: HYPOTHESES AND CORRESPONDING INDICATORS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

HYPOTHESIS	QUESTION #	QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM
1:Perception of seriousness of crime.	1 & 2	Crime in Edmonton is a very serious problem. There is more crime in Edmonton than there was five years ago.
2:Experience with victimization.	38 & 39	During the last year, did anyone illegally enter your residence? During the last year, did anyone take something directly from you by using force?
3:Knowledge	26 & 27	Have you ever toured a prison or corrections centre? Are you personally acquainted with an inmate?
4:Individual versus societal responsibility for crime.[a]	7,12 & 26	The roots of crime lie in our society. The roots of crime lie with the individual. Which of the following are important causes of crime? -individual characteristics -forces beyond the control of the offender -low intelligence -need for employment -lack of will power -desire for wealth or status -lack of education opportunities -family upbringing.

[a] It should be noted that the Rose (1976) study employed a single measure to tap the individual-societal dimension. The questionnaire item was phrased "In your opinion, which is more to blame for crime?" The possible responses were the individual, the society, or individual and society equally.

and over was 41.00. With regards to educational attainment, 43 percent had some high school or were high school graduates; 15 percent reported they had vocational school training; 28 percent indicated they had attended university or were university graduates, and 13 percent had done graduate or professional work. The median annual family income was found to be $17,023.

Considering the studies were carried out in two different countries, at different periods of time, an examination of the characteristics above would suggest the samples are quite comparable. A presentation of the findings follows.

Perception of Crime as a Serious Problem

The first hypothesis dealt with the perception of the seriousness of crime. Rose (1976) tapped this question by asking the respondents how they felt about crime in their state and presented them with a continuum ranging from "a very serious problem" to "not a problem at all". In the present study the respondents were presented with two questions, the response alternative ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The items were "Crime in Edmonton is a very serious problem" (Question 1), and "There is more crime in Edmonton than there was

five years ago" (Question 2). In the statistical analysis, the items were compared separately and in combination. Rose (1976) reported a weak but significant relationship for this hypothesis. In the present study, an examination of the correlation between Question 1 and the dependent variable revealed a relationship significant at the .001 level (r=.262); Question 2 was significant at the .005 level (r=.148). When the two items were combined to form one variable we found r=.249, ($p < .001$) (see Table 4.2). The first hypothesis, dealing with the perception of the seriousness of crime was supported.

Experience with Victimization

The second hypothesis states that there would be no relationship between the experience of victimization and receptivity toward correctional reform. The questionnaire items which correspond to this hypothesis are: Question 38, "During the last year, did anyone illegally enter your residence?, and Question 39, "During the last year, did anyone take anything directly from you by using force?" The t-test revealed support for this hypothesis. As in the Rose (1976) study no relationship was found between victimization and the dependent variable (see Table 4.3).

EDMONTON SAMPLE

TABLE 4.2: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS INDICATING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND RECEPTIVITY TO CORRECTIONAL REFORM

HYPOTHESIS	VARIABLE	r	p
1	Crime a serious problem	.262	<.001
1	Crime increasing	.148	.005
1	Concern	.249	<.001
3	Knowledge	-.135	<.009
4	Roots of crime societal	-.183	<.001
4	Roots of crime individual	.395	<.001
4	Societal factors	-.188	<.001
4	Individual factors	.252	<.001
5	Education	.310	<.001
6	Income	.089	.061
7	Occupation	.157	.003
5-7	SES	.267	<.001
8	Age	-.277	<.001

TABLE 4.3: MEAN RESPONSE ON DEPENDENT VARIABLE AND T-TESTS FOR SEX, VICTIMIZATION AND KNOWLEDGE

VARIABLE	GROUPS	CASES	MEAN RESPONSE ON DEPENDENT VARIABLE	t	p
Victimization	Victims	5	36.4	-.75[a]	.454
	Non-victims	272	39.3		
Knowledge	Knowledge	36	43.0	2.58[b]	.006
	No Knowledge	196	38.0		
Sex	Female	141	40.0	1.81[a]	.036
	Male	161	38.0		

[a] Based on pooled variance estimate (F test for difference between standard deviations n/s)

[b] Based on separate variance estimate (F test for difference between standard deviations significant)

The Effect of Knowledge

This dimension was tapped by asking respondents "Have you ever toured a prison or corrections centre?" and "Are you personally acquainted with an inmate?" (Questions 36 & 37). The data supported the hypothesis relating knowledge and receptivity toward correctional reform when the t-test was employed (see Table 4.3). Students' t tells us whether the difference between means between groups is significant, but tells us nothing about the direction of the differences. By employing Pearson's correlation coefficient (treating knowledge as a dichotomous variable), r=-.135 (see Table 4.2). The relationship between knowledge and the dependent variable was opposite the direction predicted, that is, it appears those persons with first-hand knowledge are least likely to be receptive to correctional reform.

Societal vs. Individual Responsibility for Crime

Rose posed the hypothesis that those who attributed the responsibility for crime to the individual would be least receptive to correctional reform. Support was found for her hypothesis ($r=.159$, $p < .001$). In order to test this hypothesis, Rose asked her respondents a single question: "In your opinion, which

is more to blame for crime?". The response categories were: the individual, the soceity, the individual and society equally. The present study asked respondents their degree of agreement to the questionnaire items "The roots of crime lie in our society" (Question 7) and "The roots of crime lie with the individual" (Question 12). In addition, a separate question (Question 26) was included which presented the respondents with specific items on which they were asked to rank the causes of crime. The items consisted of an amalgamation of alternatives which were viewed as societal and individual in content. The items which tapped the individual dimension were: individual characteristics, low intelligence, and lack of will power. The items which located societal factors as significant were: nature of our society, forces beyond the control of the offender, need for employment, desire for wealth or status, lack of educational opportunities and family upbringing. Respondents were asked which they deemed very important, important, unimportant and very unimportant. All correlations between the independent variable and the dependent variable were significant beyond the .001 level (see Table 4.2).

Demographic Variables

The dimension of socio-economic status was examined by looking at the elements of occupational prestige, income and educational attainment. Rose reported support for the hypotheses regarding occupation and education, but did not find a significant relationship between income and the dependent variable. In the present study, support was found for hypothesis 5 regarding a positive relationship between educational attainment and the dependent variable ($r=.310$, $p < .001$), and hypothesis 7 concerning occupational prestige ($r=.157$, $p < .005$). With regards to the variable of income, the present study found a stronger relationship between income and the dependent variable than did Rose, but neither were statistically significant past .05. The combination of the three elements into the dimension of SES revealed ($r=.267$, $p < .001$). It should be noted here that the occupational categories employed in the studies were different. Whereas Rose employed the Siegel (1971) occupational status scale, the present study provided the following categories:

Skilled Worker
Unskilled Worker
Semi-skilled Worker
Owner or Manager of large business
Owner or Manager of small business
Salesperson, Salesclerk, Office Worker

Professional
Large Farmer or Rancher
Small Farmer or Rancher

The various categories were divided into high, medium and low status occupations[3] thus: high status occupations were comprised of owner or manager of a large business, professional and larger farmer or rancher; medium status included skilled workers, owner or manager of a small business, salesperson, salesclerk or office worker, and small farmer or rancher; the low status category consisted of unskilled workers and semi-skilled workers.[4]

Hypothesis 8 suggested there would be an inverse relationship between age and receptivity toward correctional reform. The data supported this hypothesis. Pearson's correlation revealed ($r=-.277$, $p < .001$). Rose (1976) reports support for this hypothesis as well.

The next hypothesis regarding sex was supported as it was in the Rose study (see Table 4.3). It appears that women are more receptive to correctional reform then men.

The final hypothesis suggested that Edmontonians would be less receptive to correctional reform than would be residents of the State of Washington. This hypothesis was not supported. The findings of the present research carried out in Edmonton, and

those results of the survey in the State of Washington are in fact very similar.

Thus far the results of the tests of the ten hypotheses using the statistical techniques of the t-test and Pearson's correlation have been presented. In addition, stepwise multiple regression was employed to shed further light on the findings. Pearson's correlation coefficient "r" allowed us to measure the strength of the relationship between our predictor variables and the dependent variable, "receptivity to correctional reform." However, Pearson's product-moment correlations are zero-order correlations as no controls are imposed to ascertain the effect of the other variables. The statistical technique of multiple regression allows us to predict a single dependent variable from a set of independent variables, and permits an examination of relationships between variables in combination rather than individual correlations.

Stepwise multiple regression was performed twice, each trial included a different combination of variables in an effort to find which variables accounted for the greatest amount of variance.

The results of regression analysis between selected independent variables and receptivity to correctional reform are presented in Table 4.4. The independent variables of education and age were found to be the best predictor variables. The combination of the two variables accounted for approximately 15 percent of the variance. The perception of the seriousness of crime (concern), sex, victims and occupation add slightly to the explained variance, but the increases in R^2 are not nearly as dramatic as education and age. Table 4.5 examines the results of regression analysis on the variables of socio-economic status (formed by combining occupational prestige, income and educational attainment), individual versus societal responsibility for crime, perception of the seriousness of crime (concern), knowledge and sex. The first three variables account for over 16 percent of the variance, with the remaining variables contributing little in terms of the increase in the R^2.

We will now turn to a re-analysis of the data employing three subscales obtained through the

TABLE 4.4: STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS BETWEEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND RECEPTIVITY TO CORRECTIONAL REFORM

VARIABLE	SIMPLE R[a]	BETA	MULTIPLE R	R^2	INCREASE IN R^2
Education	.30998	.22679	.30998	.09609	.09609
Age	-.27707	-.17692	.37599	.14137	.04529
Concern	.24857	.16640	.40728	.16588	.02451
Sex	.10824	.10554	.42187	.17798	.01210
Victimization	.07034	.06921	.42696	.18230	.00432
Occupation	.15683	.04579	.42913	.18416	.00186

[a]The effects of simple R and beta are not discussed in the text of the thesis, but are reported in the regression tables for the benefit of the reader who desires further information.

TABLE 4.5: STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS BETWEEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND RECEPTIVITY TO CORRECTIONAL REFORM

VARIABLE	SIMPLE R	BETA	MULTIPLE R	R^2	INCREASE IN R^2
SES	.26704	.18567	.26704	.07131	.07131
Individual Factors	.25223	.20718	.33373	.11138	.04007
Social Factors	-.18810	-.22927	.40648	.16523	.05385
Concern	.24857	.16571	.43890	.19264	.02741
Knowledge	-.13537	-.11219	.44963	.20216	.00953
Sex	.10824	.10566	.46128	.21278	.01061

use of factor analysis. The findings of the tests of hypotheses will be compared with the original scale used in the foregoing analysis:

Factorially Derived Scales

Although the sixteen item scale "receptivity to correctional reform" appeared initially to be unidimensional, three separate factors or dimensions were extracted from this group of items by means of factor analysis.

The initial step involved in the analysis was the calculation of a correlation matrix. From this matrix, the principal component method of factor analysis was employed to extract the most parsimonious factor structure. That is, all responses to items in our original scale were correlated with each other to extract the common factors.

The factors were then rotated utilizing one of the orthogonal methods. Rotation serves to reclassify the variance explained by the various items. The results of the Varimax rotated matrix are presented in Tables 4.6 to 4.8. Each item loads on only one factor, suggesting that each represents a unique theoretical dimension. A total of three factors emerged. Items with strong

TABLE 4.6: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

FACTOR 1 PRISON

ITEM	LOADING
Our corrections system is too lenient with offenders.	.58801
We should give prison guards more power to discipline prisoners.	.70579
We should bring back the death penalty.	.60175
We should allow prison officials to read the prisoners' mail.	.75586
Solitary confinement should be used more often.	.69897
Greater use should be made of physical punishment in prison (for example, whipping).	.67056

TABLE 4.7: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

FACTOR 2 REHABILITATION

ITEM	LOADING
There would be fewer hardened criminals if we kept offenders in the community and out of prison.	.61135
We should favor expansion of prisons rather than corrections programmes like half-way houses.	.61137
We should stress vocational training closely related to outside jobs for prisoners.	.46762
There should be more opportunity for parole.	.37040
There should be more use made of community-based corrections (for example, half-way houses).	.74715
Offenders should be required to do voluntary work for the community rather than be sent to prison.	.68274
Community-based programmes which allow offenders to hold jobs in the community and return to jail evenings and weekends are a good idea.	.55839

TABLE 4.8: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

FACTOR 3 PRISONER RIGHTS

ITEM	LOADING
We should grant weekend leaves so that prisoners can visit their families and friends.	.65798
We should allow visits by prisoners' spouses for sexual purposes.	.77300
Prisoners should be allowed to take part in prison self-government.	.58295

loadings on the first factor tend to reflect a punitive or "hard line" attitude toward corrections. An item representative of this factor is "Our corrections system is too lenient with offenders." The second factor concerns a rehabilitative approach to corrections. Respondents taking this perspective would agree with the statement, "There would be fewer hardened criminals if we kept offenders in the community and out of prison." The third factor seems to represent a "pro-prisoners" rights factor, reflected in the item, "Prisoners should be allowed to take part in prison self-government."

The next step was to form three subscales from these three factors. This was done by converting each respondent's response on each of the sixteen items to a standardized score, multiplying this score by the factor loadings, then adding up the products to form a subscale. The three factors (the new subscales) were labelled: "Prison"; "Rehabilitation" and "Prisoner Rights".

We will now discuss the findings of the tests of hypotheses, using our three factorially derived scales as dependent variables. A comparison will be drawn between the three subscales and the original scale (receptivity to correctional reform). Identical statistical techniques were employed with the

exception of the selection of variables in the regression analysis. The variables for inclusion are dissimilar as only those variables which are significant as indicated by Pearson's correlation are included. That is, when the relationship between an independent variable and the dependent variable are not shown to be significant, they are deleted from the stepwise regression analysis.

Perception of the Seriousness of Crime

The first hypothesis suggested that those persons who viewed crime as a very serious problem would be least likely to be receptive to correctional reform. This hypothesis is supported on two of the three subscales (see Table 4.9). The correlation of highest magnitude is found with the first subscale, "Prison" in response to the questionnaire item, "Crime in Edmonton is a very serious problem", followed by the combination of Questions 1 and 2 ("Concern"). Both correlations are significant at the .001 level. With regards to concern for crime the second subscale, "Rehabilitation", reveals a correlation of $r=.173$, $p < .001$. "Prisoner Rights" however shows no significant support for this hypothesis. The strongest relationship between the

TABLE 4.9: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS INDICATING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES

VARIABLE	ORIGINAL SCALE		PRISON		REHABILITATION		PRISONER RIGHTS	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Crime a serious problem (Question 1)	.262	<.001	.232	<.001	.151	.004	.046	.213
Crime increasing (Question 2)	.148	<.005	.132	<.011	.136	.009	-.033	.281
Concern for crim (Questions 1 & 2)	.249	<.001	.221	<.001	.173	<.001	.008	.440
Knowledge (Questions 36 & 37)	-.135	.009	.031	.296	-.162	.002	-.122	.017
Cause of crime societal (Question 7)	-.183	<.001	.006	.461	-.149	.005	-.203	.001
Cause of crime indiv. (Question 12)	.395	<.001	.313	.001	.245	.110	.110	.028

TABLE 4.9: continued

Societal factors (Question 26)	-.188	<.001	.023	.346	.100	.041	.237	.001
Individual factors (Question 26)	.252	<.001	.243	.001	.132	.011	.041	.237
Education (Question 32)	.310	<.001	.273	<.001	.138	.008	.109	.029
Occupation (Question 33)	.157	.003	.089	.061	.135	.009	.036	.266
Income (Question 35)	.089	.061	.115	.023	.090	.059	-.076	.095
SES (Questions 32,33 & 35)	.267	<.001	.234	<.001	.176	<.001	.025	.334
Age(Question 31)	-.271	<.001	-.355	<.001	.018	.376	-.122	.017

independent variable of the perception of the seriousness of crime are found between the orginal scale (receptivity to correctional reform), and the subscale "Prison".

The Experience of Victimization

The hypothesis was put forth that there would be no relationship between the experience of victimization and the dependent variable. This hypothesis was supported when the original scale was employed as dependent variable, and supported as well by the Rose (1976) research. An examination of the results of the t-test (see Table 4.10) however reveals a statistically significant relationship when Prison is utilized as the dependent variable. The other two factorially derived scales indicate no support for this relationship.

The Effect of Knowledge

It was hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between first-hand knowledge and receptivity toward correctional reform. This was tapped by questionnaire items 36 and 37: "Have you ever toured a prison or corrections centre?" and "Are you personally acquainted with an inmate?". In examining the results of correlation we find that

TABLE 4.10: MEAN RESPONSE ON DEPENDENT VARIABLE AND T-TESTS FOR SEX, KNOWLEDGE AND VICTIMIZATION

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	GROUPS	CASES	MEAN RESPONSE ON DEPENDENT VARIABLE	t	p
Prison	Victims	5	-.905	2.00	0.047
	Non-victims	272	.009		
Rehabilitation	Victims	5	.156	0.38	0.704
	Non-victims	272	.013		
Prisoner Rights	Victims	5	.239	0.58	0.561
	Non-victims	272	.021		
Prison	Knowledge	36	.034	0.38	0.705
	No Knowledge	193	-.035		
Rehabilitation	Knowledge	36	.363	2.79	0.006
	No Knowledge	193	.109		
Prisoner Rights	Knowledge	36	.360	2.42	0.016
	No Knowledge	193	-.077		
Prison	Female	141	.098	2.23	0.026
	Male	161	.163		
Rehabilitation	Female	141	.024	0.57	0.571
	Male	161	.041		
Prisoner Rights	Female	141	.002	0.03	0.974
	Male	161	.002		

Rehabilitation and Prisoner Rights are statistically significant. The relationship between knowledge and the dependent variable Rehabilitation is of greater magnitude than the correlation reported for the original scale. The relationship in this instance is a negative one, that is, an examination of Pearson's correlation coefficient between the effect of knowledge and receptivity to correctional reform is opposite the direction predicted.

Individual vs. Societal Responsibility for Crime

This hypothesis was tested by analysing responses to Questions 7, 12 and 26. Pearson's correlation coefficient reveals that upon examination of the relationship between individual responsibility for crime and the dependent variable Prison indicates r=.313, Prisoner Rights reveals r=.110. With regards to the attribution of the cause of crime to societal factors, we find a significant negative correlation with Rehabilitation and Prisoner Rights (see Table 4.9). The correlation between the societal factor and the dependent variable, Prisoner Rights is stronger than that found when the original scale (receptivity to correctional reform) was employed as the

dependent variable. The items from Question 26 which made up the "individual" dimension were not found to be significant when correlated with Prisoner Rights however, both Prison and Rehabilitation demonstrate a statistically significant correlation coefficient.

The data reveal that the hypothesis regarding individual versus societal responsibility for crime and receptivity to correctional reform was supported.

Demographic Variables

A positive relationship was hypothesized between educational attainment, income level and occupational status. When the original scale was used as the dependent variable, education and occupation were found to be statistically significant, and income approached significance at the level of .061. An examination of educational attainment and the three factorially derived scales reveals a statistically significant correlation coefficient on all scales, with significant levels ranging from <.001 on Prison to <.05 on Rehabilitation and Prisoner Rights. Occupational prestige was found to be significant only with Rehabilitation as

dependent variable. Income, which was found not to be statistically significant when the original scale was employed was found to be significant only with Prison. When the three components of occupation, education and income were combined into the variable of SES a significant relationship was noted between SES and Prison and Rehabilitation. The two scales correlate at r=.234 and r=.176 respectively, both of which are significant at <.001 level (see Table 4.9).

Whereas support was found for hypothesis 9 which predicted that women would be more receptive to correctional reform than men when the original scale was employed, no significant correlation was found when the factorially derived scales were substituted for the dependent variable.

Employment of the original scale as dependent variable revealed a statistically significant relationship between all the independent variables and receptivity to correctional reform with the exception of income. When the three scales obtained through factor analysis were used as dependent variables, in four instances we report a correlation of greater magnitude than when the original scale was used.

Prison demonstrates a stronger correlation for income and age; Rehabilitation for knowledge, and Prisoner Rights for the hypothesis regarding individual versus societal responsibility for crime.

Stepwise multiple regression was utilized to isolate the best predictors of receptivity to correctional reform. Prison reveals that the variables of age, and individual vs. societal responsibility for crime account for slightly over 15% of the variance (see Table 4.11). The remaining five variables included in the regression analysis account somewhat for the explained variance, but clearly the first two independent variables are the best predictors of the dependent variables.

Regression analysis on Rehabilitation does not contribute much to explained variance. The first two variables acting together, status (SES) and knowledge account for only 5% of the variance (see Table 4.12).

The variables inlcuded in the regression analysis on Prisoner Rights were: individual versus societal responsibility for crime, knowledge, age and education. As can be seen in Table 4.13, the first two variables account for slightly over 7% of the variance.

With regards to stepwise multiple regression

PRISON

TABLE 4.11: STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

VARIABLE	SIMPLE R	BETA	MULTIPLE R	R^2	INCREASE IN R^2
Age	-.35526	-.27012	.35526	.12621	.12621
Individual Factors	.24261	.12004	.39225	.15386	.02766
Victimization	.16372	.13593	.41288	.17047	.01661
Concern for Crime	.22080	.12417	.43241	.18698	.01651
SES	.23393	.11528	.44622	.19911	.01213
Societal Factors	-.02277	-.06179	.45044	.20289	.00378
Knowledge	.03093	.04055	.45209	.20439	.00149

REHABILITATION

TABLE 4.12: STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

VARIABLE	SIMPLE R	BETA	MULTIPLE R	R^2	INCREASE IN R^2
SES	.17630	.11904	.17630	.03108	.03108
Knowledge	-.16174	-.13796	.23092	.05333	.02224
Concern for Crime	.17285	.11852	.26303	.06919	.01586
Societal Factors	-.09984	-.12920	.28513	.08130	.01211
Individual Factors	.13203	.09631	.29900	.08940	.00810

PRISONER RIGHTS

TABLE 4.13: STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

VARIABLE	SIMPLE R	BETA	MULTIPLE R	R^2	INCREASE IN R^2
Societal Factors	-.23657	-.24842	.23657	.05596	.05596
Knowledge	-.12236	-.11158	.26909	.07241	.01645
Age	-.12317	-.08542	.29094	.08465	.01224
Education	.10891	.06171	.29901	.08940	.00476
Individual Factors	.04137	.05301	.30308	.09186	.00245

analysis, the original scale and Prison reveal most of the explained variance when the combination of the first two variables entered in the analysis are examined.

The foregoing section examined the findings of the data analysis employed in testing our hypotheses. Results from the Edmonton public sample were presented and compared with the findings of the Rose (1976) study. The technique of factor analysis was then employed to create three subscales in order to examine the effects upon the relationships between our predictor variables and receptivity to correctional reform. The following chapter is devoted to a presentation of the findings obtained from the respondents in the two subsamples: local members of the John Howard Society and members of a local union.

FOOTNOTES

[1]This is not to suggest that these changes were "better" than those used by Rose. The motivation was based upon the consideration to provide equal advantage to our respondents taking into account the variation in the sample on such factors as ethnicity (first language spoken in the home, levels of education, etc.).

[2]The alpha coefficient was calculated using procedures set out in SPSS.

[3]The distribution of the occupational categories of the Edmonton sample (N=303) was as follows: Low status=57; Medium status=130; High status=96.

[4]These categories follow a similar pattern of high to low status as indicated in the socio-economic index of occupational prestige constructed by Blishen (1971).

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA: THE SUBSAMPLES

The hypotheses which were pertinent to the larger Edmonton sample were also tested by analysing the responses obtained from two subsamples: local members of the John Howard Society and members of a local union. The central focus of interest was to examine whether or not significant variation existed across the groups.

Demographic Variables

Before proceeding with a presentation of the results of the data analysis, the samples will be compared with regards to the variables of sex, marital status, age, educational attainment, occupational status and income in order to provide an overview of the sample characteristics.

Variables	Edmonton (N=303)	John Howard (N=107)	Union (N=61)
SEX	%	%	%
Female	141 (46.5)	37 (34.6)	2 (3)
Male	161 (53.1)	70 (65.4)	59 (96.7)
MARITAL STATUS			
Married	193 (63.7)	81 (75.7)	49 (80.3)
Widow	16 (5.3)	13 (12.1)	1 (1.6)
Divorced	20 (6.6)	2 (1.9)	1 (1.6)

Variables	Edmonton (N=303)	John Howard (N=107)	Union (N=61)
Separated	10 (3.3)	1 (0.9)	0
Common Law	7 (2.2)	2 (1.9)	1 (1.6)
Single	55(18.2)	8 (7.5)	9(14.8)
AGE			
Under 24	51(16.8)	0	9(14.8)
25-29	38(12.5)	4 (3.7)	13(21.3)
30-39	69(22.8)	13(12.1)	11(18.0)
40-49	49(16.2)	20(18.7)	8(13.1)
50-59	47(15.5)	30(28.0)	16(26.2)
Over 60	49(16.2)	40(37.4)	4(6.6)
EDUCATION			
Less Grade 8	15(5.0)	0	0
Grade 8-10	43(14.2)	6(5.6)	5(8.2)
Grade 11-12	29(9.6)	6(5.6)	7(11.2)
H.S. Grad.	52(17.2)	6(5.6)	18(29.5)
Vocational Sch.	44(14.5)	8(7.5)	17(27.9)
College or Univ.	46(15.2)	19(17.8)	10(16.4)
Univ. Grad.	35(11.6)	15(14.0)	2(3.3)
Grad. or Prof. work	39(12.9)	47(43.9)	2(3.3)
OCCUPATION			
Low Status	57(18.8)	17(15.9)	17(27.9)
Med. Status	130(42.9)	17(15.9)	41(67.2)
High Status	96(31.7)	70(65.4)	3(4.9)
INCOME			
Under $5,000	11(3.6)	2(1.9)	1(1.6)
5-6,999	14(4.6)	3(2.8)	0
7-8,999	18(5.9)	1 (.9)	0
9-11,999	43(14.2)	4(3.7)	0
12-14,000	35(11.6)	6(5.6)	4(6.6)
15-19,999	44(14.5)	11(10.3)	19(31.1)
20-24,999	50(16.5)	14(13.1)	28(45.9)
25-29,999	36(11.9)	14(13.1)	7(11.5)
Over $30,000	37(11.2)	47(43.9)	2(3.3)

An examination of the above demographic variables demonstrates the diversity of the two samples. With regards to age, over 65 percent of the John Howard Society sample are over the age of fifty, whereas the union sample shows the highest percentages

in the 25-29 and 50-59 categories. Educational attainment reveals a dramatic disparity as well. Over 43% of the John Howard Society have engaged in graduate or professional work, compared to slightly over 3% of the union sample. Members of the John Howard Society are over-represented in the high status occupations, and report an income level consierably higher than both the union sample and the Edmonton public sample.

We now turn to a presentation of the findings. The statistical techniques employed in the analysis are identical to those previously employed. It was not possible to examine two of our hypotheses with regards to the union sample. Responses to questionnaires indicated no experience with victimization (hypothesis 2), and in addition females are grossly under-represented (hypothesis 9). Members of the John Howard Society reported no experience with victimization. With regards to the union sample then, two hypotheses remain untested, and one hypothesis is unexamined for the John Howard Society.

Perception of the Seriousness of Crime

As with the data analysis previously carried out, we examined three components in carrying out the

test of the hypothesis: crime is a serious problem, crime is increasing, and a combination of the two items which we felt indicated concern over the seriousness of crime. It was hypothesized that persons who viewed crime as a serious problem would be least receptive to correctional reform. A statistically significant relationship was found with the John Howard Society sample, but the correlation coefficients for the union sample were not significant (see Table 5.1). On two of the items examined, correlations for the John Howard sample were higher than for the Edmonton sample.

The Effect of Knowledge

An examination of the correlation coefficients between knowledge and the dependent variable reveals a significant negative correlation with the John Howard Society, but no significant relationship with the other subsample. When the t-test was employed, again the union responses were not found to be significant. Analysis of the John Howard Society respondents however revealed a statistically significant relationship (Table 5.2). The questionnaire responses revealed that in response to the query regarding touring of prison or a corrections centre, 62 percent of the John Howard Society answered affirmatively. In

TABLE 5.1: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS INDICATING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND RECEPTIVITY TO CORRECTIONAL REFORM

VARIABLE	EDMONTON PUBLIC		JOHN HOWARD SOCIETY		UNION	
	r	p	r	p	r	p
Crime a serious problem (Question 1)	.262	<.001	.178	.034	.068	.302
Crime increasing (Question 2)	.148	<.005	.193	.024	.188	.073
Concern for crime (Questions 1 & 2)	.249	<.001	.294	<.001	.147	.129
Knowledge (Questions 36 & 37)	-.135	<.001	-.174	.037	-.103	.216
Cause of crime societal (Question 7)	-.183	<.001	-.336	.001	-.079	.273
Cause of crime indiv. (Question 12)	.395	<.001	.231	.010	.256	.023
Societal factors (Question 26)	-.188	<.001	-.134	.085	-.407	.001
Individual factors (Question 26)	.252	<.001	.076	.219	.315	.007

TABLE 5.1: continued

VARIABLE	EDMONTON PUBLIC		JOHN HOWARD SOCIETY		UNION	
	r	p	r	p	r	p
Education (Question 32)	.310	<.001	.074	.224	.217	.047
Occupation (Question 33)	.157	.003	-.061	.268	.004	.499
Income (Question 35)	.089	.061	-.001	.494	.154	.119
Status (Questions 32, 33 & 35)	.267	<.001	.013	.446	.231	.037
Age (Question 31)	-.277	<.001	-.054	.291	-.526	<.001

THE JOHN HOWARD SOCIETY

TABLE 5.2: MEAN RESPONSE ON DEPENDENT VARIABLE AND T-TESTS FOR SEX AND KNOWLEDGE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	GROUPS	CASES	MEAN RESPONSE ON DEPENDENT VARIABLE	t	p
Sex	Female	37	46.4	1.55	.124
	Male	70	44.0		
Knowledge	Knowledge	45	46.0	1.86[a]	.034
	No Knowledge	30	43.0		
			UNION MEMBERS		
Knowledge	Knowledge	6	41.2	1.02[a]	.157
	No Knowledge	40	37.4		

"a" based on 1-tailed test (direction predicted)

addition, over 50 percent of the sample indicated they were personally acquainted with an inmate.

Individual versus Societal Responsibility for Crime

It was predicted that those persons who attributed responsibility of crime to individual factors would be least receptive to correctional reform. Results of the analysis of the Edmonton public sample revealed the opposite result. An examination of Table 5.1 reflects the same pattern across the two subsamples. While the Union sample reports no significant relationship on the first two items examined, we find that the John Howard Society sample reflects correlation coefficients which are significant. The correlation between the first item and the dependent variable is of greatest magnitude with the John Howard sample, exceeding the Edmonton public sample.

Demographic Variables

The variables of education, occupation and income were examined separately, and in combination as the variable of SES. In no instance did the analysis of the John Howard Society yield a correlation between these variables and receptivity to correctional reform that was of statistical significance. Union members

sampled however reported significant relationships with regards to education and SES (both significant at <.05 level).

It was hypothesized that there would be an inverse relationship between age and receptivity to correctional reform. Support is found for this hypothesis with our union sample (r=-.526), but the relationship was not repeated with the John Howard sample (see Table 5.1).

The hypothesized relationship between sex and the dependent variable was found not to be significant with respect to the John Howard Society.

Stepwise multiple regression was performed on both samples to isolate those variables which were the best predictor variables. The results of the analysis are reported in Tables 5.3 and 5.4. With respect to the John Howard Society, the combination of the independent variables of concern, i.e. perception of the seriousness of crime, and the variable of societal responsibility for crime accounted for over 14% of the variance. As indicated in Table 5.4, the combination of age and societal responsibility for crime emerge first in the analysis, demonstrating the significance of those variables with respect to receptivity to correctional reform.

JOHN HOWARD SOCIETY

TABLE 5.3: STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS BETWEEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND RECEPTIVITY TO CORRECTIONAL REFORM

VARIABLE	SIMPLE R	BETA	MULTIPLE R	R^2	INCREASE IN R^2
Concern	.29369	.30579	.29369	.08625	.08625
Societal	-.13367	-.36685	.33830	.11445	.02819
Individual	.07581	.27491	.39511	.15611	.04166
Knowledge	.17360	.19458	.43985	.10346	.03736

UNION MEMBERS

TABLE 5.4: STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS BETWEEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND RECEPTIVITY TO CORRECTIONAL REFORM

VARIABLE	SIMPLE R	BETA	MULTIPLE R	R^2	INCREASE IN R^2
Age	-.52613	-.33392	.52613	.27681	.27681
Societal	-.40730	-.29866	.57273	.32802	.05121
Individual	.31507	.24257	.60850	.37027	.04225
SES	.23096	.30594	.62918	.39587	.02560
Education	.21677	-.17867	.63693	.40568	.00981

Selected Issues

In addition to the questionnaire items included for the purposes of the major analysis of the present study some questions were selected for admission which were related in a general manner to the research. Two items were included in the questionnaire which dealt with the issue of specific and general deterrence. Question 6 asked respondents the extent to which they endorsed the following: "Those who break the law should be punished in order to discourage the offender from further crime." Question 8 read: "Those who break the law should be punished in order to discourage others from criminal acts." The relationship between specific and general deterrence and the dependent variable "receptivity to correctional reform" were examined by employing Pearson's correlation coefficient. A statistically significant relationship was found for both the John Howard Society sample and the union sample. With regards to the variable of specific deterrence the John Howard sample yielded an r of .309, significant at the .001 level; the union sample indicated r=.545, significant at the .001 level. On the issue of general deterrence, a correlation coefficient of r=.489 (significant at the .001 level) was found for the

John Howard Society and a coefficient of r=.357 (significant at the .01 level) was found for the union sample.

Question 27 of the questionnaire presented the respondents with six examples of convicted offenders. They were asked to choose the sentence they deemed most appropriate for the offense described. The results of these findings are reported in percentages in Tables 5.5, 5.6 and 5.7. In all instances, members of the John Howard Society exhibited a more lenient stance than the Edmonton sample and the union sample. In the second hypothetical offence presented (use of heroin), however the highest percentage in all samples suggested supervision in the community as an appropriate sentence. Relatively speaking the most lenient sentences were for cashing a stolen pay cheque, and using heroin. Selling heroin and assault with a gun received the harshest sentences.

Question 28 asked the respondents their views on differential treatment of offenders who were under 21 years of age, over 60 years of age and female. With respect to younger offenders, 60% of the Edmonton public sample and the union sample suggested that being young should make no difference in the sentence imposed. The John Howard Society sample however

SELECTED OFFENSES AND SEVERITY OF SANCTIONS

TABLE 5.5: EDMONTON PUBLIC SAMPLE (N=303)

	Super-vision in com-munity	Confine-ment on weekends & nights	Prison 3-6 months	Prison 1 year	Prison 2-3 years	Prison 4-5 years	Prison more than 6 years
A person is found guilty of cashing stolen payroll cheques for the first time.	14.9%	20.8%	35%	16.5%	6.9%	2.6%	2.0%
A person is found guilty of using heroin for the first time.	36.3%	19.5%	21.1%	17.2%	3.3%	1.0%	0.3%
A person is found guilty of selling heroin for the first time.	1.7%	5.6%	16.5%	19.1%	16.5%	12.9%	26.4%
A person is found guilty of armed robbery of a company payroll for the first time.	1.7%	2.0%	7.6%	20.5%	32.2%	14.5%	21.5%

TABLE 5.5: continued

A person is found guilty of burglary of a home for the first time, stealing a colour TV set.	6.9%	11.9%	26.7%	30.0%	16.5%	2.6%	3.6%
A person is found guilty of assault with a gun on a stranger for the first time.	0.3%	1.7%	4.6%	17.8%	25.4%	20.8%	27.4%

SELECTED OFFENSES AND SEVERITY OF SANCTIONS

TABLE 5.6: JOHN HOWARD SOCIETY (N=107)

	Super-vision in com-munity	Confine-ment on weekends & nights	Prison 3-6 months	Prison 1 year	Prison 2-3 years	Prison 4-5 years	Prison more than 6 years
A person is found guilty of cashing stolen payroll cheques for the first time.	41.1%	28.0%	16.8%	11.2%	-	-	-
A person is found guilty of using heroin for the first time.	52.3%	27.1%	11.2%	5.6%	-	-	-
A person is found guilty of selling heroin for the first time.	8.4%	13.1%	14%	21.5%	22.4%	8.4%	10.3%
A person is found guilty of armed robbery of a company payroll for the first time.	2.8%	7.5%	17.8%	23.4%	23.4%	13.1%	10.3%

TABLE 5.6: continued

A person is found guilty of burglary of a home for the first time, stealing a colour TV set.	18.7%	29.9%	26.2%	10.3%	8.4%	.9%	3.7%
A person is found guilty of assault with a gun on a stranger for the first time.	4.7%	5.6%	12.1%	22.4%	23.4%	15.9%	14.0%

SELECTED OFFENSES AND SEVERITY OF SANCTIONS

TABLE 5.7: UNION SAMPLE (N=61)

	Supervision in community	Confinement on weekends & nights	Prison 3-6 months	Prison 1 year	Prison 2-3 years	Prison 4-5 years	Prison more than 6 years
A person is found guilty of cashing stolen payroll cheques for the first time.	13.1%	24.6%	26.2%	26.2%	8.2%	1.6%	-
A person is found guilty of using heroin for the first time.	37.7%	24.6%	16.4%	13.1%	6.6%	-	-
A person is found guilty of selling heroin for the first time.	-	11.5%	11.5%	18.0%	23.0%	11.5%	24.6%
A person is found guilty of armed robbery of a company payroll for the first time.	-	3.3%	8.2%	18.0%	26.2%	29.5%	14.8%

TABLE 5.7: continued

A person is found guilty of burglary of a home for the first time, stealing a colour TV set.	6,6%	16.4%	27.9%	29.5%	9.8%	4.9%	4.9%
A person is found guilty of assault with a gun on a stranger for the first time.	-	1.6%	4.9%	11.5%	26.2%	18.0%	37.7%

indicated that if an offender is under the age of 21, he should receive a lighter sentence (61%). Whether an offender was over the age of 60 made no difference to the Edmonton sample (61%) nor to the union sample (71%). The John Howard Society sample however was almost evenly divided on the issue with 47% suggesting a lighter sentence, and 49% maintaining there should be no difference in the sentence received. Females fared the most poorly as approximately 90% of the respondents in the three samples felt that this criterion should not influence sentencing practices.

The present chapter has reported the findings of the data analysis of the two subsamples of the John Howard Society and our sample of union members. The final chapter of this thesis is devoted to a discussion and interpretation of the findings of the analysis carried out in Chapters IV and V.

CHAPTER VI

INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS

This survey sought to measure attitudes of the general public toward correctional and penal issues, and to examine social correlates which could play a role in influencing those attitudes. Based upon the relevant literature, and drawing upon the study carried out by Rose (1976), ten hypotheses were examined in the present study. Chapters IV and V described the statistical analyses employed in carrying out the test of hypotheses. The present chapter is devoted to a discussion of those findings.

The first hypothesis stated that persons who viewed crime as a serious problem would be least receptive to correctional reform. An examination of the data from the Edmonton general public sample revealed support for this hypothesis. Of those sampled, 92% of the respondents endorsed the statement relating to the seriousness of crime in Edmonton; 97% responded affirmatively to the statement that crime was on the increase. This finding among the Edmonton sample reflects the view of various polls and surveys and confirms earlier research on the topic. Rose (1976) examined this hypothesis as

well and, consistent with the present study reported that receptivity to correctional reform was positively related to the tendency not to perceive crime as a serious problem. Of the two subsamples examined in the present study, a statistically significant relationship between perception of the seriousness of crime and receptivity to correctional reform was found among the John Howard Society respondents, but no association was found for the Union members sampled. This survey employed three subscales as dependent variables using the techniques of factor analysis. The three subscales were labelled according to the dimensions they appeared to represent "Prison", "Rehabilitation" and Prisoner Rights". A statistically significant relationship was found between perception of seriousness of crime and subscale Prison, and perception of seriousness of crime and Rehabilitation. No association was established between the independent variable and Prisoner Rights as dependent variable.

Experience with victimization was set forth in the form of a null hypothesis. No relationship was expected to be found between experience with victimization and receptivity to correctional reform. The data derived from the Edmonton public sample revealed support for this hypothesis. It must be

noted, that among the respondents (N=303), only five indicated they had been victims of a crime. However, Rose (1976) who examined this hypothesis did not report a significant relationship even though the case size was much larger (Victims: N=303; Non-Victims: N=790). The two subsamples, the John Howard Society and the Union members did not report experience with victimization. The findings of the present research and that of the Rose (1976) study lend further support to suggestions that the experience of victimization does not become a major controlling factor in a person's life. Biderman et al., 1967 reported that of those interviewed, few of the persons who had been victims of a crime were actually able to recall the occurrence. From the evidence of the present study and the Rose (1976) survey, it appears that whether or not one is a victim has little bearing upon their attitudes toward issues in corrections.

The third hypothesis examined the relationship between the independent variable "knowledge" and receptivity to correctional reform. It was suggested that persons who had personal acquaintance

with an inmate, or who had toured a prison or corrections centre would, through social contact and interaction, be in favor of less punitive policies. An examination of the subsamples and the factorially derived subscales revealed that in two instances no association was established, that is, no relationship was found between the independent variable of knowledge and receptivity to correctional reform when the data was analyzed for the Union sample, nor was a significant association established when Prison was employed as dependent variable. The Edmonton general public sample and the John Howard subsample, however revealed a statistically significant relationship. The relationship however was opposite to the direction predicted. This is a surprising finding especially with regards to the John Howard Society subsample. It was expected that their knowledge of the workings of the criminal justice system (61.7% had toured a prison or corrections centre; 52.3% reported acquaintance with an inmate) would make for a more "informed" view of corrections and subsequently encourage a more permissive stance toward issues of rehabilitation. It appears that those who have first-hand knowledge of the system are in fact <u>least</u> receptive to correctional policies as they now stand. A comment regarding

this finding is in order. The impetus for the questionnaire item regarding personal knowledge was derived from the research carried out by Smith and Lipsey (1976) in which a correlation was reported between endorsement of conjugal visitation (which would be considered a permissive policy) and personal acquaintance with an inmate; the second item dealing with tours of correctional institutions emerged from an observation presented by Galliher (1970). It may be that these two items did not adequately tap the dimension of knowledge. A more sensitive instrument may be required to probe into extent and type of knowledge. That is, has the social contact and interaction been casual in nature or intense in form? Have the tours been of prisons of a maximum security character or of a structure generally permissive in policy?

The next hypothesis posited that the attribution of causes of crime to individual factors would make one recticent to accept changes in correctional policies which would stress the reintegration of the offender into the community. Respondents were presented with two dichotomous items identifying the origin or the roots of crime as either individual or societal. In addition a separate question was included

which asked the respondents to identify factors which they deemed important causes of crime, with choices containing items considered "individual" and "societal". This hypothesis was supported by the Edmonton public sample and the two subsamples. Those who attribute the cause of crime to individual factors express a more punitive stance than those who view the origin of crime within the social structure. The results of the present study are consistent with that reported by Rose (1976). When the subscales Prison, Rehabilitation and Prisoner Rights are utilized as dependent variables in the examination of this hypothesis the results remain unchanged. The hypothesis which stated that those who attribute the causes of crime to individual factors would be least receptive to correctional reform was borne out. Bogart and Hutchison (1978) review public attitudes towards social problems, and report that whether one takes a structural or individualistic view toward social issues is strongly influenced by demographic variables. The individualistic view, they suggest is one which permeates large segments of the American public. Evidence cited by the authors

indicate that upper income Protestants are more apt to exhibit an individualistic stance; whereas lower-income Blacks view the social order and economic exploitation as to blame. In light of this article, further analysis was performed to examine the relationship between the individual vs. societal dimension and selected demographic variables. A statistically significant relationship was found between educational attainment, and occupational prestige when correlations between the individualistic dimension and these variables were examined for the Edmonton public sample. It appears that of those sampled among the general public, the higher status respondents are more likely to attribute causes of crime to individual factors.

The next five hypotheses which were examined were related to demographic variables. The fifth hypothesis predicted a positive relationship between educational attainment and receptivity to correctional reform. This hypothesis was supported for both the Edmonton Public sample and the Union subsample respondents. A statistically significant relationship was found for this hypothesis and the factorally derived scales. We conclude then that

there is a positive relationship between educational attainment and receptivity to correctional reform. When educational attainment was combined with the variables of occupational prestige and income level, the variable of education stands out as indicating the correlation of greatest magnitude on this dimension. The John Howard Society subsample did not reveal a statistically significant relationship when educational attainment and the dependent variable were examined. This observation can be accounted for the fact that there was not sufficient variability within this sample. The highest category related to educational attainment was the item "graduate or professional work", and 43.9% of the John Howard Society indicated this response.

The next hypothesis predicted a positive relationship between income and the dependent variable. As in the Rose (1976) study this hypothesis was not supported. The only exception to this trend was found with Prison which revealed a weak but statistically significant relationship.

A positive relationship was posited between occupational attainment and receptivity to correctional reform. This hypothesis was supported for the Edmonton public sample and subscale Rehabilitation,

but was not maintained for the subsamples. Again, this could be attributed to the fact that in both cases we are dealing with limited occupational groups.

When the three foregoing elements are examined in combination to form the independent variable of SES, the hypothesis was supported for the Edmonton public sample and union members, but was not borne out for the John Howard Society subsample. An examination of the subscales reveals that Prison and Rehabilitation indicate support for the hypothesis.

The next hypothesis predicted an inverse relationship between age and receptivity to correctional reform. The data from the Edmonton public sample indicated support for this hypothesis as did the union subsample. Indeed, the union subsample respondents indicated a higher correlation with age and the dependent variable than with all other predictor variables examined. Rose (1976) reports support for this hypothesis in the direction predicted. Data from the John Howard Society subsample however, did not reveal a statistically significant relationship. The question of sufficient variance

within the sample again emerges as an issue as 65% of the respondents indicated they were over the age of fifty. The two subscales Prison and Prisoner Rights reveal statistically significant relationship in the predicted direction.

The next hypothesis stated that women would be significantly more receptive to correctional reform than men. Consistent with the findings of Rose (1976) analysis of the data for the Edmonton public sample indicated support for this hypothesis. No statistically significant relationship was found for the John Howard respondents. With regards to the subscales, only the Prison scale was positively related to the hypothesis that women would be more receptive to correctional reform than men.

The final hypothesis suggested that Edmontonions would be less receptive to correctional reform than would residents of the State of Washington. This hypothesis was not borne out. Of the hypotheses examined, results are almost identical. In all instances a comparison of the results indicates that Edmonton respondents reveal correlations of stronger magnitude between the predictor variables and the

dependent variables than those reported by Rose.

In summary, an examination of the data analysis as it relates to the Edmonton sample reveals support for all but three of the proposed hypotheses. The hypothesis which stated that those who had first-hand knowledge of the corrections system, or were acquainted with an inmate would be more receptive to correctional reform was not borne out. In fact the subsample with the greatest knowledge of the system, the John Howard Society respondents indicate that the reverse may be true. That is, those with most knowledge, whether in the form of personal acquaintance or knowledge of correctional facilities, were less likely to endorse changes (as measured by the items which made up the dependent variable).

The hypothesis which stated that there would be a positive relationship between income level and receptivity to correctional reform was not supported from the data gathered from the Edmonton general public respondents.

Based upon an examination of the literature which suggests that the results of various polls and surveys indicate Canadians are more likely to endorse the death penalty than are their American counterparts, and based upon the observation put forth by the Law Reform Commission which points to Canada as one of

harshest countries in the world when it comes to the employment of prison sentences, the hypothesis was put forth that Edmontonions would be considerably less receptive to correctional reform than would be respondents of the State of Washington. This hypothesis was not borne out.

To summarize the findings of the Edmonton public sample, "receptivity to correctional reform", the dependent variable was found to be inversely related to age, but positively related to the tendency to attribute the responsibility of crime to societal factors, the tendency not to view crime as a serious problem, educational attainment and occupational prestige. No relationship was found between receptivity to correctional reform and income or experience with victimization. A statistically significant relationship was found between first-hand knowledge and correctional reform, however, the relationship was opposite the direction predicted. An examination of the findings reveals that the Edmonton sample and the State of Washington sample exhibit a similar stance toward the correctional issues reviewed.

With regards to the John Howard subsample, those hypotheses dealing with demographic variables were not supported. The relationship between the

dependent variable, receptivity to correctional reform and educational attainment, occupational prestige, income level, age and sex was not found to be statistically significant. As previously mentioned, this finding could be attributed to the fact that there was not sufficient in-sample variability among the respondents.

An examination of the Union subsample reveals that the hypotheses concerning perception of the seriousness of crime, first-hand knowledge, occupation and income were not supported in this survey.

When the three factorially derived subscales were included in the analysis as dependent variables, the subscale Rehabilitation (which contained items which reflected a leaning toward community-based corrections) indicated support for the majority of the hypotheses with the exception of the hypotheses concerning income and age. With regards to subscale Prison, the hypotheses dealing with first-hand knowledge and occupation were not borne out. Only four of the hypotheses were supported employing Prisoner Rights as dependent variable: the attribution of the responsibility of crime to the individual, the effect of knowledge, age and educational attainment. Examining the three subscales simultaneously, we find

that in two instances support was found across all three, namely, individual versus societal responsibility for crime and educational attainment. Although factor analysis increased our confidence that the items reflected a uni-dimensional scale, the overlap which was found in some cases is not surprising. It simply seems to indicate that the public does not view correctional issues in terms of black and white. In a review of various surveys Harris indicates that the public does not view restraint and rehabilitation as incompatible items. This contention is further supported by Duffee and Ritti (1977). In a study carried out in Pennsylvania, they constructed nine statements which tapped the dimensions of retribution and rehabilitation. Employing correlation analysis they found a clustering of responses concerning incarceration (closing down of prisons) and a second relating to rehabilitation (job training). The authors conclude that the public view is structured within the conceptually different categories of retribution and rehabilitation. The findings of the present research which indicate that the results of the employment Prison and Rehabilitation in some instances reveal similar findings is consistent with the observations of previous studies:

> Of all the attitudes uncovered by polls, none is as difficult to interpret as the majority's demand for swift punishment, more severe sentencing policies, less leniency within the courts and rehabilitation as the ultimate goal of correction. (Doleschal, 1970:468).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The data examined in the present study employed questionnaire items which were phrased to assess general attitudes toward selected issues in the area of corrections. The findings presented here are, of course, limited in their generalisability, and precise comparisons with previous research may not be drawn. Further research must be carried out to substantiate the findings which have been presented here, however results of the research allows tentative conclusions and observations to be made.

The research was based upon the Rose (1976) study, but was guided as well by the relevant literature and empirical data available in the area of public opinion toward correctional philosophy. Results obtained in this survey are in some instances dissimilar to those reported in previous research. The quantity of responses and the diversity of those responses in the survey suggests that the public sampled is interested and concerned with issues in

corrections, and not apathetic as some (for example, Harris, 1968) have suggested. The findings also reveal that the public is generally positive in attitude toward correctional reform, and not as punitive as some (for example, Gibbons, 1968) assume.

Galliher (1970) has submitted that encouraging tours of correctional institutions would allow for a more controlled view of corrections, thereby assisting in fostering positive attitudes toward permissive policies toward corrections. Results of the present survey indicate that respondents who had toured correctional facilities, or were acquainted with an inmate, i.e., those who had a "first-hand knowledge" of corrections were, in fact, less receptive to correctional reform, and expressed a more punitive stance than those who were not knowledgeable of the workings of the system. This is not to say that the present study suggest that tours be discouraged or interaction with offenders be more limited. An examination of the findings of the individual versus societal dimension of the causes of crime should be considered here. It was found that those persons who attributed the causes of crime to individual factors were more punitive than those who located the origin of crime within societal forces. If the public is to be

"informed" or "educated" with regards to the correctional system as we may conclude they wish to be, and as is their right to be, stressing the influence of the societal dimension may be a means of fostering less negative attitudes toward offenders and toward correctional institutions. Another finding which emerged from the present research was that those who maintain an individualistic stance (and therefore a more punitive one) are generally respondents in the higher socio-economic strata. Perhaps these persons feel they have achieved their position in society because they have "paid their dues", whereas those in the lower strata have not faired as well at the hands of societal institutions and feel sympathy for the "underdog". This is speculative of course, but the individual versus societal dimension and the influence of socio-economic status upon the stance taken toward corrections is worthy of further investigation.

A word is in order regarding community-based corrections programmes as opposed to the reliance on policies which stress the isolation of offenders. As previously mentioned, policy-makers have often proceeded with programmes which

stress the reintegration of offenders within the community, or have not proceeded with the implementation of new programmes for fear that the public would not countenance such policy. There has been little research in the area of public opinion toward correctional policy, and much that has been done has been cursory in nature. Policy-makers obviously have not made their decisions totally divorced from the influence of the public. It would be of interest to examine which segments of the public have influenced those decisions to date. The role of interest groups and their impact upon the criminal justice process is an area worthy of further examination.

With regards to statistical analysis specifically, a major element which emerges from the present study, relates to the importance of the use of factor analysis. Rose (1976) was perhaps remiss in not employing the technique, and may be criticised for placing too much confidence in her dependent variable on the basis that coefficient alpha (which is a basic test of reliability) seemed to indicate that the elements which comprised the dependent variable seemed to represent a common dimension. In the present study, through the use of factor analysis

three separate dimensions were extracted attesting to the complexity involved in the measurement of attitudes.

The present study has sought to examine public opinion toward certain issues in the area of correctional and penal policies and has attempted to isolate those social correlates which account for variation among the attitudes. The present survey was exploratory in nature, and no theoretical framework was set forth. The intention was to examine general attitudes toward selected issues. As has been pointed out, there is a paucity of research in the area of public opinion toward corrections. Although hopefully the present research has aided in sheding further light on public attitudes toward certain issues, further studies devoted to an in-depth analysis of public opinion are required. As was stated at the onset of this paper, programmes such as diversionary tactics, de-criminalization strategies, and community-based corrections are being implemented with scant knowledge of how the public feels toward these policies which directly influence them.

Additional research is required to ascertain

precisely what the public deems are the goals of the system of corrections. The present study did not examine the effect of the media upon public perception of correctional issues. With regards to the perception of the seriousness of crime, this may be a powerful variable in shaping attitudes toward crime control. Subsequent research and study will hopefully reflect sufficient sophistication and depth in order to assist policy-makers dealing in the criminal justice system. It is hoped that this thesis has provided a modest foundation for future studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Friends Service Committee. 1971. Struggle for Justice: A Report on Crime and Punishment. New York: Hill and Wang.

Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedure (California) 1975. "Public Knowledge of Criminal Penalties." Pp. 74-90 in Henshel and Silverman (eds.), Perception in Criminology. New York: Columbia University Press.

Berk, Richard A. and Peter Rossi. 1977. Prison Reform and State Elites. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co.

Biderman, Albert D., Louise A. Johnson, Jennie McIntyre and Adrianne Weir. 1967. Field Surveys 1. Report on a Pilot Study in the District of Columbia on Victimization and Attitudes Toward Law Enforcement. A Report of a Research Study Submitted to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Blalock, Hubert M. 1972. Social Statistics. (Second Edition.) New York: McGraw Hill.

Blishen, Bernard R., Frank E. Jones, Kaspar D. Naegele and John Porter (eds.) 1971. Canadian Society. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada.

Bogart and Hutchison. 1978. "Public Attitudes Toward Social Problems: The Impact of Shared Life Experiences in the Community of Residence." Social Problems. Vol. 26. No. 1 (October). Pp. 97-111.

Campbell, Angus, Gerald Gurin and Warren Miller. 1954. The Voter Decides. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson & Co.

Canadian Committee on Corrections. 1969. Toward Unity: Criminal Justice and Corrections. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Carter, Robert M. 1972. "The Diversion of Offenders." Federal Probation Vol. 36. No. 4: Pp. 31-36.

Carter, Robert M., Daniel Glaser, and Leslie T. Wilkins. 1972. Correctional Institutions. New York: J. B. Lippincott.

Carter, Robert M., Richard A. McGee, and E. Kim Nelson. 1975. Corrections in America. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States. 1972. Marshalling Citizen Power to Modernize Corrections. Washington, D.C., Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Chandler, David. 1976. Capital Punishment in Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.

Chandler, Robert. 1972. Public Opinion: Changing Attitudes on Contemporary Political and Social Issues. New York: R. R. Bowker Co.

Conklin, John E. 1975. The Impact of Crime. New York: MacMillan.

Dillman, Don A., James A. Christenson, Edwin H. Carpenter, and Ralph M. Brooks. 1974. "Increasing mail questionnaire response: a four state comparison." American Sociological Review 39: Pp. 744-56.

Doleschal, Eugene. 1970. "Public Opinion and Correctional Reform." Crime and Delinquency Literature 2 (August): Pp. 465-476.

Duffee, David and R. Richard Ritti. 1977. "Correctional Policy and Public Values." Criminology, Vol. 14. No. 4: Pp. 449-458.

Ennis, Philip H. 1967. Field Survey II of the President's Commission on Law-Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, Criminal Victimization in the United States: A Report of a National Survey. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Fagan, Ronald W. Jr. 1978. "Public Attitudes Toward the Courts." Unpublished paper presented at Pacific Sociological Association Meeting, Spokane, Washington.

Fox, Vernon. 1974. "Prisons: reform or rebellion?" Pp. 388-403 in Charles E. Reasons (ed.), The Criminologist: Crime and the Criminal. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Co.

Furstenberg, Frank F. Jr. 1971. "Public reaction to crime in the streets." The American Scholar 40: Pp. 601-610.

Galliher, John. 1970. "Attitudes of Missouri Citizens Toward the State Prison." Criminology 8 (November): Pp. 239-250.

Gibbons, Don C. 1963. "Who Knows What About Correction?" Crime and Delinquency 9, (April): Pp. 137-144.

Gibbons, Don C., Joseph E. Jones, and Peter G. Garabedian. "Gauging Public Opinion About the Crime Problem." Crime and Delinquency 18, (April): Pp. 135-146.

Harris, Louis. 1968. "Changing Public Attitudes Toward Crime and Corrections. Federal Probation 32 (December): Pp. 9-16.

Henshel, Richard L. and Robert A. Silverman. 1975. Perception in Criminology. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hindelang, Michael J. 1974. "Public Opinion Regarding Crime, Criminal Justice and Related Topics." Journal Research in Crime and Delinquency Vol. 11, No. 2: Pp. 101-116.

Hogarth, John. 1971. Sentencing as a Human Process. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Johnson, Elmer H. 1974. Crime, Correction and Society. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.

Kerlinger, Fred. N. 1973. Foundations of Behavioral Research. (Second Edition). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Korn, R. 1971. "Of Crime, Criminal Justice and Corrections." University of San Francisco Law Review 6 (October): Pp. 27-75.

McIntyre, Jennie. 1967. "Public Attitudes Toward Crime and Law Enforcement." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 374 (November): Pp. 36-46.

Martinson, Robert. 1974. "What Works? - questions and answers about prison reform." The Public Interest No. 35 (Spring): Pp. 22-54.

Miller, Walter B. 1973. "Ideology and Criminal Justice Policy: Some Current Issues." The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 64 (June): Pp. 141-162.

Morris, Norval. 1966. "Lessons From the Adult Correctional System of Sweden." Federal Probation Vol. 30. No. 4: Pp. 3-13.

_____ 1974. The Future of Imprisonment. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Morris, Norval and Gordon Hawkins. 1970. The Honest Politician's Guide to Crime Control. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. 1973. Corrections. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. 1967. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington D.C.: J.S. Government Printing Office.

_____ 1967. "Crime and Its Impact: An Assessment. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Quinney, Richard. 1970. The Social Reality of Crime. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Reasons, Charles E. 1974. "Correcting Corrections." Pp. 357-365 in Charles E. Reasons (ed.) The Criminologist: Crime and the Criminal. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Co.

Richardson, Richard J. et al. 1972. "Public Attitudes and the Legal Justice System." Research Previews 19 (April): Pp. 1-6.

Rose, Vicki McNickle. 1976. Public Opinion Concerning Correctional Policies and Prison Reform. Washington State University. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

Rummel, R.J. 1967. "Understanding Factor Analysis." Journal of Conflict Resolution Vol. 11: Pp. 444-479.

Schur, Edwin M. 1969. Our Criminal Society. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

_____ 1973. Radical Non-Intervention: Re-thinking the Delinquency Problem. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Scull, Andrew T. 1977. Decarceration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Siegel, Paul M. 1971. Prestige in American Occupational Structure. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Chicago in Rose, Vicki Public Opinion Concerning Correctional Policies and Prison Reform. Washington State University. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

Skoler, Daniel. 1975. "Future Trends in Juvenile and Adult Community-Based Corrections." Pp. 3-15 in Gary R. Perlstein and T.R. Phelps (eds.). Alternatives to Prison. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company.

Smith, David Lewis and McCurdy Lipsey. 1976. "Public Opinion and Penal Policy." Criminology, Vol. 14. No. 1 (May): Pp. 113-124.

Stanley, David T. 1976. Prisoners Among Us. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Taves, John M. and Armand L. Mauss. 1975. "Corrections and Punishment." Pp. 148-200. in Armand L. Mauss, Social Problems as Social Movements. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.

Tepperman, Lorne. 1977. Crime Control. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, Ltd.

Vidmar, N. and P. Ellsworth. 1974. "Public Opinion and the Death Penalty." Stanford Law Review 26 (June): Pp. 1245-1270.

APPENDIX A:

CORRESPONDENCE

Centre for Criminological Research
POPULATION RESEARCH LABORATORY
TEL. (403) 432-4659, 432-5797

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA T6G 2H4

July 20, 1978

Dear Householder,

The attached questionnaire has been sent to your household in order that we may learn of your opinions toward certain issues in the area of corrections. Your household is one of five hundred in the City of Edmonton which has been randomly selected to participate in this research project.

We ask you to carefully read and complete the questionnaire. Your views and opinions are extremely important to this study. For your convenience, a postage-paid envelope has been enclosed for the return of your completed questionnaire.

Your participation in this project is wholly voluntary. After you have mailed back your completed questionnaire, you have the freedom to request that your reply be withdrawn. Please note that this is an ANONYMOUS questionnaire. Do not sign your name. Your answers will be held in strictest confidence.

Your cooperation in completing and returning the questionnaire as soon as possible is requrested. Should you desire to inquire about the final results of this study, this information will be made available to you.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. If you have any questions regarding the study, please feel free to phone me at 432-5941.

Sincerely yours,

Louise Morose

We request that the male householder complete the questionnaire if applicable.

Centre for Criminological Research
POPULATION RESEARCH LABORATORY
TEL. (403) 432-4659, 432-5797

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA T6G 2H4

July 20, 1978

Dear Householder,

The attached questionnaire has been sent to your household in order that we may learn of your opinions toward certain issues in the area of corrections. Your household is one of five hundred in the city of Edmonton which has been randomly selected to participate in this research project.

We ask you to carefully read and complete the questionnaire. Your views and opinions are extremely important to this study. For your convenience, a postage-paid envelope has been enclosed for the return of your completed questionnaire.

Your participation in this project is wholly voluntary. After you have mailed back your completed questionnaire, you have the freedom to request that your reply be withdrawn. Please note that this is an ANONYMOUS questionnaire. Do not sign your name. Your answers will be held in strictest confidence.

Your cooperation in completing and returning the questionnaire as soon as possible is requested. Should you desire to inquire about the final results of this study, this information will be made available to you.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. If you have any questions regarding the study, please feel free to phone me at 432-5941.

Sincerely yours,

Louise Morose

We request that the female householder complete the questionnaire if applicable.

Centre for Criminological Research
POPULATION RESEARCH LABORATORY
TEL. (403) 432-4659, 432-5797

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA T6G 2H4

July 31, 1978

Dear Householder,

Last week a questionnaire was mailed to your household to assist us in studying the opinions of Edmonton residents toward certain issues in the area of corrections. Your household was one of five hundred in Edmonton randomly selected to participate in this research project.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please accept my sincere thanks for your time and cooperation. If you have not as yet returned the questionnaire, please do so today as your views and opinions are vital to this study. Remember this is an ANONYMOUS questionnaire.

For your convenience, a replacement copy of the questionnaire is enclosed.

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions, please call at 432-5941.

Sincerely yours,

Louise Morose

Centre for Criminological Research
POPULATION RESEARCH LABORATORY
TEL. (403) 432-4659, 432-5797

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA T6G 2H4

August 7, 1979

Dear Householder,

Two weeks ago a questionnaire was mailed to your household asking your views and opinions on certain issues in the area of corrections. As yet, we have not received your completed questionnaire. If you have returned the questionnaire, thank you most sincerely for your time and cooperation. If you have not done so, please complete and return the questionnaire today. Your participation is extremely important to this study.

If you have misplaced the questionnaire, please call me at 432-5941 and another will be forwarded immediately.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Louise Morose

APPENDIX B:

QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

There are no right answers to the following questions; we are interested in your opinions. Please answer every question as best you can. Circle the number which designates your answer.

	CIRCLE ONE			
	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
1. Crime in Edmonton is a very serious problem.	1	2	3	4
2. There is more crime in Edmonton than there was five years ago.	1	2	3	4
3. There would be fewer hardened criminals if we kept offenders in the community and out of prison.	1	2	3	4
4. Our corrections system is too lenient with offenders.	1	2	3	4
5. We should favor expansion of prisons rather than corrections programmes like half-way houses.	1	2	3	4
6. Those who break the law should be punished in order to discourage the <u>offender</u> from further crime.	1	2	3	4
7. The roots of crime lie in our society.	1	2	3	4
8. Those who break the law should be punished in order to discourage <u>others</u> from criminal acts.	1	2	3	4

		CIRCLE ONE			
		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
9.	Younger offenders should be given lighter sentences.	1	2	3	4
10.	If a convicted offender is an elderly person he should receive a lighter sentence.	1	2	3	4
11.	We should grant weekend leaves so that prisoners can visit their families and friends.	1	2	3	4
12.	The roots of crime lie with the individual.	1	2	3	4
13.	We should stress vocational training closely related to outside jobs for prisoners.	1	2	3	4
14.	Convicted female offenders should get shorter sentences than males convicted for the same offence.	1	2	3	4
15.	We should give prison guards more power to discipline prisoners.	1	2	3	4
16.	We should bring back the death penalty.	1	2	3	4
17.	We should allow prison officials to read the prisoners' mail.	1	2	3	4
18.	Solitary confinement should be used more often.	1	2	3	4
19.	We should allow visits by prisonsers' spouses for sexual purposes.	1	2	3	4
20.	There should be more opportunity for parole.	1	2	3	4

CIRCLE ONE

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
21. Prisoners should be allowed to take part in prison self-government.	1	2	3	4
22. There should be more use made of community-based corrections (for example, half-way houses).	1	2	3	4
23. Offenders should be required to do voluntary work for the community rather than be sent to prison.	1	2	3	4
24. Greater use should be made of physical punishment in prison (for example, whipping).	1	2	3	4
25. Community-based programmes which allow offenders to hold jobs in the community and return to jail evenings and weekends are a good idea.	1	2	3	4

	VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UNIMPORTANT	VERY UNIMPORTANT
26. Which of the following are important causes of crime?				
- individual characteristics	1	2	3	4
- forces beyond the control of the offender	1	2	3	4
- low intelligence	1	2	3	4
- need for employment	1	2	3	4
- lack of will power	1	2	3	4
- desire for status or wealth	1	2	3	4
- lack of educational opportunities	1	2	3	4
- family upbringing	1	2	3	4

27. Below are five examples of convicted offenders. Please read each, then circle the number to the right which is the sentence you think the offender ought to receive.

	Supervision in community	Confinement on weekends & nights	Prison 3-6 months	Prison 1 year	Prison 2-3 years	Prison 4-5 years	Prison more than 6 years
A person is found guilty of cashing stolen payroll cheques for the first time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A person is found guilty of using heroin for the first time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A person is found guilty of selling heroin for the first time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A person is found guilty of armed robbery of a company payroll for the first time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A person is found guilty of burglary of a home for the first time, stealing a colour TV set.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A person is found guilty of assault with a gun on a stranger for the first time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

28. Please indicate whether you feel an offender should be given a HARSHER or LIGHTER sentence for the same offense in the circumstances below, or whether it would make no difference in your opinion.

	Usually a HARSHER Sentence	Usually a LIGHTER Sentence	Makes No Difference
The offenders is under 21 years of age.	1	2	3
The offender is over 60 years of age.	1	2	3
The offender is female.	1	2	3

Finally, we would like to ask you a few questions about yourself. Please circle a number.

29. 1. Female
    2. Male

30. Marital Status?
    1. Married
    2. Widowed
    3. Divorced
    4. Separated
    5. Common Law
    6. Single

31. Date of birth?
    _____(year)

32. Level of education completed?
    1. Less than Grade 8
    2. Grade 8-10
    3. Some Grade 11 or 12
    4. High School Graduate
    5. Vocational Training or Trade School
    6. Some College or University
    7. College or University Graduate
    8. Graduate or Professional Work

33. Which of the following categories would you place yourself in? If you are retired or unemployed, please answer this question for your last occupation.

1. Skilled worker (carpenter, plumber, etc.)
2. Unskilled worker (night watchman, waiter, etc.)
3. Semi-skilled worker (taxi driver, etc.)
4. Owner or manager of a large business
5. Owner or manager of a small business
6. Salesperson, sales clerk or office worker
7. Professional (doctor, lawyer, teacher, nurse)
8. Large farmer or rancher
9. Small farmer or rancher
10. Student
11. Other: Title _____

    Kind of Work (Duties) _____

    Kind of Company or Business _____

34. What is the first language spoken in the home?

    _____

35. Please estimate your total family income in 1977 before taxes and deductions. Include all relatives including common law living with you. Consider a single person living alone as a family.

1. Under $5,000.00
2. $5,000.00 - $6,999.00
3. $7,000.00 - $8,999.00
4. $9,000.00 - $11,999.00
5. $12,000.00 - $14,999.00
6. $15,000.00 - $19,999.00
7. $20,000.00 - $24,999.00
8. $25,000.00 - $29,999.00
9. Over $30,000.00

36. Have you ever toured a prison or corrections centre?

1. Yes
2. No

37. Are you personally acquainted with an inmate?

1. Yes
2. No

38. During the last year, did anyone illegally enter your residence?

1. Yes
2. No

39. During the last year, did anyone take something directly from you by using force?

1. Yes
2. No

Thank you very much for your cooperation. Your contribution to this project is greatly appreciated.